

Corporation for the month of October 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1618. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1619. A bill to provide for the prompt closing of relocation centers maintained by the War Relocation Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1620. A bill to provide for the retention of naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 1621. A bill to authorize payment of increased pension on account of dependents for any period not more than 1 year prior to receipt of evidence showing the existence of such dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1623. A bill to amend section 511 (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1624. A bill to permit approximately 3,000 natives of India who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, to become naturalized; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1625 (by request). A bill providing for the abolition of the office of coroner and for the organization of the office of medical examiner for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1626. A bill amending paragraph 16, schedule A, of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 15 (c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1627. A bill to permit certain living expenses while away from home incurred by Members of the Congress to be deducted for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 96. Resolution authorizing continuance of study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans, as authorized under House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. Res. 97. Resolution providing expenses for continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 75; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. Res. 98. Resolution to amend rule 111 of the House, with respect to the duties of

the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, requesting the appointment of a southern representative to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Michael C. Donatelli; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of William Tolar Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of James Owens; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Raymond Crosby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of the estate of R. A. Ellison, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1637. A bill to authorize the issuance of an unrestricted patent on certain lands to Henry S. Giddens; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1638. A bill granting a pension to Olivia Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hortense Arnow, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Patrick Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Edith Popwell; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

24. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 22 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Port Hope (Mich.) Presbyterian Church approving legislation for the elimination of the sale of intoxicants in Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1945

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, when it was called to order by HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, Vice President of the United States, whose entrance into the Senate Chamber was greeted with applause.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to whom a thousand years are as but one day, our brief stay is but as a watch in the night, yet, while last its ebbing hours, make us bold and swift and brave to do Thy will. From this exalted chair of governance, bless him who goes and pour the riches of Thy grace upon him who comes. As the new President of this body takes reverently into his hand today the historic gavel into which has seemed to enter every decision since the Nation's founding, may the mantle of the great public servants whose hands have grasped it fall in double portion upon him. Give him fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, the kindly heart, nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in man that is more than coronets.

To the Chief Executive of the Republic as for a new term of his high office he turns to problems more tragic and thorny than any man in history ever knew, may there be given the wisdom from above; make clear and clean his eyes; steady his hand, as on the heaving bridge of our Ship of State he with us is tossed by mountainous seas. "In spite of rocks and tempest's roar, in spite of false lights on the shore," bring our national bark to the desired haven of peace with victory and justice. Grant that before another Presidential oath is taken a grateful people may sing in glad yet humble jubilation:

"Our fearful trip is done,  
The ship has weathered every rack,  
The prize we sought is won."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.  
Amen.

#### ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat today.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H.

Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

**SENATOR FROM MISSOURI—ADMINISTRATION OF OATH**

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator-designate from Missouri, the Honorable FRANK P. BRIGGS, whose credentials I now offer for filing, is present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath of office as Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on this 15th day of January A. D. 1945, I, Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby appoint FRANK P. BRIGGS United States Senator from the State of Missouri, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term beginning January 18, 1945, and ending January 3, 1947, or until his successor shall be duly elected and qualified according to law, to fill the vacancy in the office of United States Senator created by the resignation of HARRY S. TRUMAN. This appointment is made pursuant to the authority vested in me as chief executive of the State of Missouri by the provisions of section 11540, Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Missouri. Done at the city of Jefferson this 15th day of January A. D. 1945.

PHIL M. DONNELLY.

By the Governor:

[SEAL]

WILSON BELL,  
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. BRIGGS, escorted by Mr. DONNELL, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

**INAUGURATION CEREMONIES**

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States on Saturday last be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The 20th day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, twentieth amendment, for the beginning of the Presidential and Vice Presidential terms, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of New York, and HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, were this day inaugurated President of the United States and Vice President of the United States, respectively, on the south portico of the White House.

The ceremonies were in charge of the Joint Committee on Arrangements of the

two Houses of Congress, consisting of Harry Flood Byrd, chairman; Kenneth McKellar; Arthur Vandenberg; Sam Rayburn; Robert L. Doughton; Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; and Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary.

Assembled on the south portico were the Committee on Arrangements, and their secretary, members of the families of the President and Vice President, the President's Cabinet, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, and other high military and naval officers and distinguished guests.

On the lawn surrounding the portico, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Diplomatic Corps, and a large number of citizens were gathered.

At 11:55 o'clock a. m. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President-elect, accompanied by his son, Col. James Roosevelt, United States Marine Corps Reserve, and Harry S. Truman, Vice President-elect, appeared on the portico, the United States Marine Band playing Hail to the Chief.

**INVOCATION**

The Right Reverend Angus Dun, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou alone holdest rightful rule over the kingdoms of the world, and without Thy favor we are but dust that builds on dust. As we, the people of these United States, intrust the powers of government to those whom we have chosen, enable us to dedicate them, and to rededicate ourselves, to the tasks to which Thou has called us. Keep us ever mindful of the sacrifices we ask of those who give their lives on our behalf; keep us mindful of the heritage of good or of ill which we shall leave to our children and to our children's children. Hold these Thy servants, and us, steadfastly faithful to the maintenance of responsible liberty for all, and equal justice under law. For the sake of this people and of all peoples, lift those who bear authority among us above the claims of class, the prejudices of race, the seeking of party advantage, and make them in truth the resolute servants of the common good. And in these days of perplexity and pain, forbid that we shall be content with any peace save that of a world at unity with itself where all nations in mutual trust may bring their glory unto Thy kingdom. Hear us, O Father, and grant our prayer for the honor of Thy holy name.

**ADMINISTRATION OF OATH**

The Vice President of the United States administered to the Vice President-elect the oath of office prescribed by law, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear

true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter: So help you God?

The VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT. I do.

The Chief Justice of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution; as follows:

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, you do solemnly swear that you will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and that you will to the best of your ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States?

The PRESIDENT-ELECT. I, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. So help you God.

The PRESIDENT-ELECT. So help me God.

**INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT**

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Vice President, my friends, you will understand and, I believe, agree with my wish that the form of this inauguration be simple and its words brief.

We Americans of today, together with our allies, are passing through a period of supreme test. It is a test of our courage—of our resolve—of our wisdom—of our essential democracy.

If we meet that test—successfully and honorably—we shall perform a service of historic importance which men and women and children will honor throughout all time.

As I stand here today, having taken the solemn oath of office in the presence of my fellow countrymen—in the presence of our God—I know that it is America's purpose that we shall not fail.

In the days and in the years that are to come we shall work for a just and honorable peace, a durable peace, as today we work and fight for total victory in war.

We can and we will achieve such a peace.

We shall strive for perfection. We shall not achieve it immediately—but we still shall strive. We may make mistakes—but they must never be mistakes which result from faintness of heart or abandonment of moral principle.

I remember that my old schoolmaster, Dr. Peabody, said, in days that seemed to us then to be secure and untroubled: "Things in life will not always run smoothly. Sometimes we will be rising toward the heights—then all will seem to reverse itself and start downward. The great fact to remember is that the trend of civilization itself is forever upward; that a line drawn through the middle of the peaks and the valleys of the centuries always has an upward trend."



Our Constitution of 1787 was not a perfect instrument; it is not perfect yet. But it provided a firm base upon which all manner of men, of all races and colors and creeds, could build our solid structure of democracy.

And so today, in this year of war, 1945, we have learned lessons—at a fearful cost—and we shall profit by them.

We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men, not as ostriches, nor as dogs in the manger.

We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that "The only way to have a friend is to be one."

We can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust or with fear. We can gain it only if we proceed with the understanding, the confidence, and the courage which flow from conviction.

The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts and strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith which has become the hope of all peoples in an anguished world.

So we pray to Him now for the vision to see our way clearly—to see the way that leads to a better life for ourselves and for all our fellow men—to the achievement of His will, to peace on earth.

#### BENEDICTION

The Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, pronounced the following benediction:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Almighty and all-merciful God, we beseech Thee to bless the United States of America, inspire our magistrates and legislators with wisdom and prudence; infuse the minds and hearts of our people with sentiments of loyalty, cooperation, and brotherhood. Crown, we beseech Thee, our fighting forces with a decisive and righteous victory, and bring to all the nations of the world a just and lasting peace.

In particular, we beg Thee to bless, enlighten, and strengthen the man who has this day been reinaugurated in his great office. The tasks which he faces are supremely difficult; the responsibilities which he assumes are weightier and more complex than those that burdened any of his predecessors. Continue, we beseech Thee, to bless and prosper his efforts and endeavors for social and international justice.

Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The ceremonies were concluded by the rendition of the Star-Spangled Banner by the United States Marine Corps Band.

#### REPORT ON THE WAR BY GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate the announcement I made a few days ago that on Wednesday the 24th

of this month at 9 o'clock in the morning General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and Admiral King, Chief of Operations of the United States Navy, will give to Members of Congress a confidential report on the present status of the war and related subjects.

We have all received a formal invitation from General Marshall and Admiral King, and the place where the report is to be made is set out in the invitation. I merely wish to emphasize that the report is to be made Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock, and it will be concluded in time for Senators to report at the Senate for the day's business.

I am sure we shall all profit by the information we get from General Marshall and Admiral King, which I know will be information we cannot otherwise obtain. I hope all Senators who possibly can will attend.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was sorry that I was unable to be present last Thursday when the sad news of the death of Senator MALONEY was announced to the Senate.

I first knew Senator MALONEY when he was a Member of the House several years ago. When he came to the Senate he became a member of the Appropriations Committee, of which I was the acting chairman, and quickly proved himself to be one of the most efficient, fair, active, and vigorous members of that committee.

Senator MALONEY was in the early years of a brilliant and useful career. He was born in 1894 and was just 50 years of age. He served in the Navy in the First World War and made an enviable record. He was Mayor of Meriden, his home city, from 1930 to 1933. He was elected in 1932 to the House of Representatives of the Seventy-third Congress and served in that body until 1935, when he took the seat in the Senate to which he had been elected in 1934. He was re-elected in 1940.

Senator MALONEY had a most engaging personality. Always smiling, good-looking, and in every way attractive, he made friends with all. He was a good fighter for every principle he supported and he made an able and forceful Senator.

He was not satisfied with all of the rules of procedure of the Senate and he had submitted a resolution to reorganize the Senate so as to make it more efficient. He was a liberal. He was a strong Democrat and a strong party man, but never offensive to those who disagreed with him. I think he was one of the most capable men who ever served in the Senate.

Personally I was devoted to him, and I think he liked me. We got along splendidly on the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate. I believe I never heard him say anything unkind about others.

The Senate of the United States will miss him. He was a great ornament to the body. He was a profound student of government. He was wise and his counsel was ever welcome and helpful. He loved our country and he loved our Government, and he just naturally loved people.

I am greatly distressed at his passing away. I saw him only a short time ago and he was the picture of health. I thought I had never seen a stronger, healthier, more able-bodied man.

I join with other Senators in expressing my heartfelt sorrow and my deepest sympathy to his stricken family.

#### EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JONES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed on January 20 by the President to Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and the reply of Mr. Jones to the President.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1945.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington.

DEAR JESSE: This is a very difficult letter to write—first, because of our long friendship and splendid relations during all these years, and also because of your splendid services to the Government, and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the administration.

It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry, and I want to tell you that it is in no way a lack of appreciation for all that you have done, and I hope you will continue to be a part of the Government.

During the next few days I hope you will think about a new post—there are several ambassadorships which are vacant—or about to be vacated. I make this suggestion among many other posts and I hope you will have a chance, if you think well of it, to speak to Ed Stettinius.

Finally, let me tell you that you have my full confidence and that I'm very proud of all you have done during these past years.

With my warm regards, always sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 20, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have your letter of today, asking that I relinquish my post as Secretary of Commerce, which carries with it the vast financial and war production agencies within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, so that you can give it to Henry Wallace as a reward for his support of you in the campaign.

You state that Henry thinks he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce and that you consider him fully suited for the post. With all due respect, Mr. President, while I must accede to your decision, I cannot agree with either of you.

You refer very kindly to our long friendship and our splendid relations during all the years, and state that you appreciate my splendid services to the Government and the excellent way I have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years. You are

also good enough to say that I have your full confidence, and that you are very proud of all I have done during these past years, and that you hope I will continue to be a part of the Government, probably in a diplomatic post. It is difficult to reconcile these encomiums with your avowed purpose to replace me. While I want to be of any further service that I can, I would not want a diplomatic assignment.

I feel and have felt a great sense of responsibility to the Congress and to you for the proper administration of the laws with respect to the R. F. C. that have been passed in the expectation that they would be administered by me or someone experienced in business and finance.

I have had satisfaction in my Government service because I have had the confidence of the Congress, as well as your own. I have had that confidence because I have been faithful to the responsibilities that have been intrusted to me. For you to turn over all these assets and responsibilities to a man inexperienced in business and finance will, I believe, be hard for the business and financial world to understand.

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to serve my country through the depression and in time of war. My 13 years of Government service are ample evidence of my desire to be of any assistance to the Government. I can best be helpful in the line of my life's work—business and finance—but I seek no job.

With best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

JESSE H. JONES.

#### APPOINTMENT OF HENRY A. WALLACE AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement I have issued with respect to the appointment of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The appointment of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, with control of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and 10 subsidiary Government corporations, could not have been based on either the business experience, training, or aptitude of the appointee for this work.

If Jesse Jones did a good job, and the President said he did, by no manner of logical reasoning could the exercise of the same vast powers by Mr. Wallace result in anything like a similar administration. I can say this and still acknowledge, as I am glad to do, the high character and sincerity of Mr. Wallace.

Eliminating at this time a discussion of the important duties of the Secretary of Commerce, I can think of no person less suited by temperament and business ability to undertake the management of the vast Reconstruction Finance Corporation than Mr. Wallace. I say this with personal knowledge of his past public record in such matters, and notably his management of the Board of Economic Warfare, which the joint economy committee of which I am chairman investigated, and from which he was wisely and properly removed by the President.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with its 10 subsidiaries, is the most colossal banking institution the world has ever known, either public or private. By reason of blanket authorizations for loans, and the right to issue bonds, fully guaranteed by the Government, it is virtually immune from the control of Congress. I have frequently pointed out that it is in actuality, as it now operates, a fourth branch of the Government. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and its kindred corporations, has made

either loans or commitments in excess of \$40,000,000,000. Loans are revolving in the sense that when paid off they can be used to make commitments or loans for other purposes.

The correspondence between the President and Mr. Jones indicates that Mr. Wallace was permitted to select a position and be the judge of his own qualifications in return for his political services in the recent campaign. An appointment made under these conditions makes it imperative that the Senate of the United States protect the interests of the American people in the exercise of its power to reject Presidential nominations.

Mr. Wallace is the leader of the most radical groups in America. He is the close friend and coworker of Sidney Hillman and the extreme elements of the C. I. O. The maintenance of free enterprise means the preservation of our American way of life. It may well be that the action of the United States Senate on this appointment will have a decisive effect on the future of the free enterprise system.

#### RESIGNATION OF JESSE JONES AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two telegrams which explain themselves.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 22, 1945.

Senator K. D. McKELLAR:

Strongly protest shelving of Jones and hope you will work against confirmation of Wallace as Secretary of Commerce as consider him dangerous influence and totally unfit for this highly important post.

H. B. POTTS.

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 22, 1945.

Hon. K. D. McKELLAR:

Shocked to hear of Jones forced resignation. Think Wallace absolutely unqualified for Secretary of Commerce post. Sincerely hope you will use your influence against such appointment.

NEWTON C. PERKINS.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

##### REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report as to whether any new wire or radio communication legislation is necessary in order better to insure the safety of life and property (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

##### OCTOBER 1944 REPORT OF R. F. C.

A letter from the chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of October 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

##### REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

A letter from the chairman of the Board and secretary of the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1944, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### JOINT MEMORIAL OF LEGISLATURE OF ARIZONA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

##### Senate Joint Memorial 2

Joint memorial requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the treaty with Mexico relating to the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers

##### To the Senate of the United States:

Your memorialist represents that it is the belief of this body that the pending treaty between the United States and Mexico, respecting the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, as clarified by the protocol signed November 14, 1944, will, as it pertains to the waters of the Colorado River, prove very beneficial to the United States and to the State of Arizona.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

1. That your honorable body ratify the proposed treaty at the earliest possible date.

#### CONCENTRATION OF POWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution recently adopted by the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, sent to me by Mr. E. C. Moriarty, of Wichita, president.

This resolution addresses itself to a situation that is disturbing to many of us, that is, the increasing powers which are being seized by Federal agencies under extremely broad interpretations being given the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. Without undertaking to say that this resolution points toward the right solution, I desire to express my approval of its purpose. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at this point as part of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the tendency of the Federal administration in recent years toward construction of what constitutes interstate commerce has gone far beyond the wishes and beliefs of the public; and

Whereas the Town Hall Committee of Wichita believing that the abuse has reached the point where some action should be taken to correct the tendency; and

Whereas the effect of the recent construction of interstate commerce has been to eliminate and curtail free enterprise and bring practically every business within the control of Federal bureaus.

Now, therefore, we, the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, recommend to Congress that it give full and immediate consideration to an amendment to the Constitution that will limit and define "commerce among the several States" as set forth in the Constitution so as to better meet the needs of the people in protecting their liberties and property and in this connection we cite, as outstanding examples, the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in



the case of the *Southeastern Underwriters Association and Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U. S. 111), the latter case holding in substance that a farmer cannot feed his own wheat to his own livestock, because to do so would depress interstate commerce.

#### MANPOWER SHORTAGE—BEER AND LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Miss Ethel R. Copenhaver, Meade, Kans., urging that, in view of the manpower shortage, the liquor distilleries and breweries be closed and men given employment in industries where they are needed to produce materials for war purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEADE, KANS., January 15, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am taking this liberty of writing you about some of the very great and grave problems that confront us today in the United States of America.

First, this manpower shortage that we hear and read so much about. In all sincerity I ask, Why can't the needed manpower be drawn from nonessential industries, such as breweries, and put where it is needed, either in factories or the battle fronts?—as well as the huge saving of sugar, grains, and fuel which we do know can be of no benefit to the human body. For the harm it does our fighting men I am greatly opposed to our shipping the enormous amounts of beer and liquor that we do to our fighting men. I have two wonderful boys, one being now in France. I am sure opposed to this poison we are allowing to be set before them. How much more sensible to leave some young men (that really know farming) on the farms, and take them out of the distilleries.

Yours for a Christian United States  
of America,

ETHEL R. COPENHAVER.

#### INDEPENDENCE OF POLAND

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter and resolution which I have received from the Polish-American citizens of Clinton, Mass., asking that due recognition be given to the independence of the Republic of Poland, as it existed before September 1939, and that the present Polish Government-in-exile be recognized.

I suggest that this letter and resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DEPARTMENT,  
TOWN SOLICITOR'S OFFICE,  
Clinton, Mass., January 15, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The representatives of the various Polish-American societies and professions have instructed me to send you the enclosed resolution for your kind consideration.

We have followed your leadership from the beginning and shall appreciate any response you care to make in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY E. MACORA, Attorney.

Whereas the United States of America has always safeguarded and protected the sovereignty of all small nations in maintaining the boundaries established prior to September 1939; and

Whereas the United States was the first nation to recognize and acknowledge meritoriously the present Polish Government-in-exile established in London; and

Whereas your honor, as our senior Senator, you were one of the first to evaluate the principles of the now historic meeting promulgating the famous precepts of the Atlantic Charter, which held the old established boundaries of small nations as inviolate and sacred, without any changes whatsoever until all hostilities cease: Be it

Resolved, That there be noted on your official records the sentiment and sympathetic feeling of Polish-American citizens in this area, that due recognition be given to the independence of the Republic of Poland as it existed before September 1939, and that you perpetuate your valiant leadership in continuing to recognize the present Polish Government-in-exile.

Rev. JOHN OSZAJCA,

Pastor, St. Mary's Parish of Clinton.

Rev. A. S. NASIATKA,

Curate, St. Mary's Parish of Clinton.

STANLEY E. MACORA,

Attorney and Town Solicitor of Clinton.

WALTER F. JAROS,

President, Thaddeus Kosciuszko Association.

EDWARD NICEWICZ,

President, Polish National Alliance.

JOSEPH F. SIOK,

President, Polish-American Citizens Club.

GABRIEL SANDROWSKI,

Secretary, Polish Roman Catholic Union.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred letters and resolutions sent me by the United Polish Organization and Polish Mothers' Association of World War No. 2 of Salem, Mass.; by the pastor and parishioners of St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Church, of Chicopee, Mass.; by the Federation of Polish-American Societies of Greater Boston; and by the American Women of Polish Descent of Bondsville, Mass., urging a just treatment for Poland.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. STANISLAUS

BISHOP AND MARTYR CHURCH,

Chicopee, Mass., January 16, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution which was drawn up and ratified by the members of this parish on January 7. This resolution was sent to the President. We are firmly convinced that the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were not just a passing fancy but the real ideals for which we are at present entangled in the world-wide conflict. To us they are the very essence of our American way of life. Outside of those, we have no other ambitions. It seems to us that Poland and other small and weak nations are really the test and proving grounds for the application of those principles. It would be most unfortunate for the American posterity if the present shedding of American blood would have been in vain. Russia's or any other big nation's unilateral land grabs are incompatible with these principles.

The people of this parish have been in close contact with you, Mr. WALSH, during your many years in public service. They have

come to know you for your sincerity and sound principles. To them you are much more than a public servant—a man ever faithful to the trust they have placed in you. They consider you to be a true American, and they love you more than you will ever realize. They are grateful to you for your interest in their good-being here and in the country of their forefathers. They are of the opinion that American principles of justice and freedom must prevail in the end if these are dispensed by such public leaders as yourself.

I have tried to convey the opinions of this parish on matters which they consider of grave importance. To these may I add, for them and myself, "God bless you, Mr. WALSH, and grant you every possible good wish."

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE PIASECKI, O. M. C.,  
Pastor.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
President of the United States,  
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: Saint Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Roman Catholic Church with all its members, societies, and many fraternal organizations is in accord with the contents of the resolution sent to you by the Polish American Congress on December 22, 1944. All have faith that you will adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Only through a just treatment of Poland and the small nations can real peace endure.

Therefore, we ardently request that action be taken for the following reasons and facts:

Whereas 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent stand determined in defense of the cultural rights of Poland to her pre-war boundaries and territory, and

Whereas for over 3 years our country, jointly with its Allies, has been engaged in a titanic struggle, the outcome of which will determine whether the American way of life and man's inherent right to self-determination will survive, and

Whereas our American boys answered the call for our country—they went to war in defense of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Over 2,500 boys, members of this parish, are already in the Army and Navy for the same cause, and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of the American boys are shedding their blood in the sacred cause of human rights of men and nations. Are their sacrifices to be in vain and the principles and rights for which they are fighting be repudiated and trampled upon? Many have already made the supreme sacrifice—43 boys of this parish are among the dead heroes—and because they are not able to speak for themselves, it is our sacred duty to speak for them,

Therefore, we, duly accredited Polish American citizens, members of the Saint Stanislaus Bishop Martyr Polish Roman Catholic Church, assembled here today, Sunday, January 7, 1945, unanimously

Resolve and dedicate ourselves to extend to our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, our continued and wholehearted support in his every undertaking in leading our Nation in its war effort. We pray Almighty God that in the trying days ahead, the blessings of divine providence be with him constantly, so that he might continue to guide our Nation to victory over the enemies of mankind: Be it

Resolved, that we call upon our President to join us and our fighting boys and Polish brethren in this important protest. We earnestly implore that our Commander in Chief will use his influence and power to prevent the greatest crime of modern times, the unjust and unhuman imposition of a foreign culture upon a great nation that has contributed so much to the culture and learning of the western and Christian's civilization—our culture: Be it

*Resolved*, That you as President, by all means, will not permit the contemplated partition of Poland and enslavement of other nations: Be it

*Resolved*, furthermore, That justice and peace may prevail forever.

EUGENE PIASECKI, O. M. C.,

Pastor, Saint Stanislaus Bishop Martyr Roman Catholic Church, Chicopee, Mass., January 7, 1945.

#### FEDERATION OF POLISH-AMERICAN

SOCIETIES OF GREATER BOSTON,

Chelsea, Mass., January 15, 1945.

To the Massachusetts Members of Congress: At a mass meeting, A tribute to Poland, held at Fanueil Hall on January 14, 1945, at Boston, Mass., the enclosed resolutions were adopted.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN F. PUCKO,

Chairman of the Resolution Committee, Whereas Poland, the first nation in Europe to reject appeasement, was the first to fight Nazi tyranny in the cause of freedom and civilization; and

Whereas Poland continues to fight valiantly on land, sea, and in the air for her cause and that of the United Nations; and

Whereas Poland is a country whose people have always throughout its history guarded the achievements of western civilization, and the democratic traditions of individual liberty and the freedom of conscience; and

Whereas Poland, in this tragic hour, despite her efforts in the cause of the United Nations, is being threatened with partition and the possible loss of her independence through the disregard of justice, international law, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

*Resolved*, that we, citizens of the United States, gathered at Fanueil Hall, the cradle of liberty, on the 14th day of January 1945, at Boston, Mass., firmly condemn a policy of settlement, and power politics in the course of the prosecution of the war.

*Resolved*, that while it is in the best interests of the Allies to maintain unity and to fight together in loyalty for their cause and for the hopes that have rallied 36 nationalities in the 6 continents to the banner of the United Nations, we declare, it is equally important that the peace settlement reached after the war is won shall be based on the democratic principles of justice, law, and the respect of the rights of all nations.

*Resolved*, that a copy of these resolutions shall be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, and to each of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Respectfully submitted by the committee on resolutions.

ROMAN F. PUCKO,

Chairman.

LILLIAN J. NEMENOSKI,

FRANK NOWAK,

GLADYS PIEKARAKI,

ELAINE H. PROABOSAGCZ,

JOHN SOKOBOUSKI.

BONDSDVILLE, MASS., January 20, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned American soldiers' mothers, sisters, and sweethearts respectfully ask if their sons fight for democracy and all nations' freedom has now decidedly become a fight for Russia's and England's world supremacy, and if their beloved Poland in particular shall be reduced to the question of dying Caesar: "Et tu Brutus contra me"? America also is now against their much beloved Poland.

Sincerely yours,

American Women of Polish Descent:

K. Pietras, M. Pietryka, A. Mihonski, K. Gula, W. Bigda, A. Ruman-

czyk, K. Duda, W. Bubon, B. Der-noga, K. Wegryn, S. Stolarz, K. Sowaa, K. Kapinos, W. Chmura, B. Godek, G. Marcinkiewicz, M. Wachta, J. Karcz, A. Stolarz, M. Kapinos, H. Bigda, M. Moniec, F. Kulig, M. Lebeda, M. Zabka, A. Stankiewicz, K. Czechowska, A. Kos, B. Starnyk, A. Nekodem, A. Lepa, R. Soltys, M. Mihonski, A. Pietruszka, K. Krawiec, A. Bigda, M. Jarosz, A. Bak, A. Skourinski, M. Gill, B. Duda, M. Lesniak, J. Piechota, A. Wodas, W. Zbylot, A. Antonowicz, J. Kos, A. Dudek, A. Wolonik, M. Krol, A. Stefanowicz, K. Dudek, M. Wolas, M. Sczygiel, A. Ksen, W. Kawalec, H. Krol, K. Bigda, B. Wloszczyna, A. Kopacz, C. Saletnik, J. Pietryka, J. Czech, J. Piechota, L. Lavinge, M. Legieza, R. Sowa, S. Wachta, H. Wachta, A. Karcz, M. Miga, S. Kapinos, K. Mazar, A. Jasak, M. Jasak, I. Gula, I. Moniec, E. Moniec, G. Moniec, J. Sowa, L. Kulig, J. Kulig, J. Lanczak, S. Lebeda, M. Geslak, P. Geslak, H. Pisarczyk, G. Pisarczyk, Am. Zabka, Z. Balow, A. Puza, K. Kuzza, J. Swiat, G. Kos, B. Mastalaz, A. Nikodem, A. Mihonski, A. Skrzyniasz, W. Bukowska, M. Kulig, A. Kozlik, L. Kozlik, L. Gill, H. Kusza, A. Pietras, H. Izyk, K. Maraj.

#### UNITED POLISH ORGANIZATION

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

January 10, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The United Polish Organizations of Salem, Mass., at a meeting held on Wednesday, December 27, 1944, at Salem, Mass., whereat the following resolution was unanimously adopted and whereat it was unanimously voted to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Hon. DAVID I. WALSH and Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senators from Massachusetts, and Hon. GEORGE J. BATES, Congressman from the Sixth Essex District of Massachusetts:

"*Resolved*, That the United Polish Organizations of Salem, Mass., protest the partition of Poland as proposed by Premier Stalin of Russia and approved by Prime Minister Churchill of England, whereby that part of Poland east of the Curzon Line, so-called, is to be given or awarded to Russia."

And the organizations further protest the statement of the Prime Minister of England that the President of the United States has directly or indirectly agreed to the proposed partition of Poland, and the organizations further record that such a partition would be a breach and a violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter which warrant confidence that the integrity of Poland and the basic rights of her people will be preserved.

Respectfully yours,

St. Joseph's Society, Branch 604, Roman Catholic Union, W. Dolmat; Sons of Poland Society, Branch 555, Polish National Alliance, J. Kozlowski, president; St. John's Society, Branch 1041, Polish National Alliance, J. Mioskiewicz, president; Polish Falcons Nest No. 188, T. Melec, president; Polish-American Citizens Club, Thomas J. Zak, president; St. Anthony's Society, John Maciejewicz, president; Polish-American Veterans and Auxiliary, J. Szostak, commandant; Women's Polish-American Citizens Club; Wanda Kolczak, president; Polish workman's Aid Fund, W. Oleck, president; St.

Anne's Society, Emelia Bachorowski, president; St. Elizabeth's Society, C. Zmyewski, president; Mrs. Julia Kobuszewski, secretary; United Polish Organization, 18 Boardman Street, Salem, Mass.

SALEM, MASS., January 20, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

Massachusetts Senator,

Washington, D. C.:

Please uphold the principles of the Atlantic Charter for the sake of Poland and all other small nations. Sixteen hundred and forty-three of our sons believe that is what they are fighting for. Your statements are appreciated, especially at Fanueil Hall.

POLISH MOTHERS ASSOCIATION,

WORLD WAR NO. 2.

#### ENDORSEMENT OF DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSAL BY SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, there has recently been issued by the Synagogue Council of America, representing orthodox, reform, and conservative Jewish religious groups an endorsement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a constructive step forward in international relations, but criticizing their lack of any spiritual motive to inspire the will to peace. A copy of the endorsement has been sent me by Rabbi Ahron Opher.

The statement, which was prepared by a committee headed by Rabbi Isaac Landman, editor of the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, declared:

The Dumbarton Oaks document provides the machinery for the possible prevention of future wars, not for the establishing of universal peace; proposals for the suppression of international violence after these occur, not for their prevention; a mechanism calculated to rectify and adjudicate international strife, not an instrument to eliminate the bases of strife and violence and war.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by these Jewish groups, and the letter endorsing it, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,

New York, N. Y., January 19, 1945.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: You were good enough to make reference to the Synagogue Council statement on Dumbarton Oaks in your remarks last night in the Town Hall meeting of the air.

May I therefore take the liberty of sending you a copy of the full text of the statement of the Synagogue Council of America, in the hope that you may want to make reference to it in the Senate?

With cordial greetings,

Yours in the service of God and country,

RABBI AHRON OPHER.

The Synagogue Council of America greets with profound gratitude the labors of the leaders and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and our own country as set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security. Although these proposals are admittedly tentative, and constitute only a preliminary and incomplete statement of a hope yet to be fulfilled, the Synagogue Council acclaims the temper in



which they are drawn. The statesmen of the four Allied Nations testified to the faith that resides in the human spirit and bespeak our own conviction that men and nations can and will cooperate to free the world of the curse of war.

The Synagogue Council of America is in full accord with the recommendation in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to establish a security council, an international court of justice, and to develop such measures as shall advance the possibilities of universal peace.

The security council would be empowered to employ force to maintain or restore international peace. Use of force to suppress the persecutor and to vanquish the oppressor is a recognized principle of Judaism. Jewish Rabbinic tradition distinguishes clearly between wars of offense and wars of defense. Wars of offense are those waged by aggressor peoples and are in defiance of the laws of God and man; Judaism condemns such wars. Wars of defense, however, are those waged against aggressors who would conquer, enslave, and destroy other peoples; Judaism makes such war obligatory, and in every country where Jews have lived they have taken part in wars of defense against the aggressor. Now that the hope to make aggressor nations powerless is inherent in the charter of the United Nations, Judaism accepts as a divine obligation the call to take up arms whenever and under what conditions a defensive battle must be waged against those who attempt to destroy the peace of the world.

We commend with deep fervor the proposed international court of justice to which power and means will be granted to enforce its decisions. Judaism, often referred to erroneously as exclusively a religion of law, was the first to entwine law with justice—"Justice, justice shalt thou pursue, that thou mayest live" (Deuteronomy xvi: 20)—and crowned both with the attribute of Mercy—"For I desire mercy, and not sacrifice" (Hosea vi: 6)—to soften and assuage the hardness and relentlessness of the strict interpretation of law. The reign of law alone, in its austerity and rigor, may prove as inefficient to thwart international aggression and crime as it has been within the individual nations. Only in the application of law tempered with justice and long-suffering in mercy, by no means, however, clearing the guilty (Exodus xxxiv: 6-7), may be achieved the contemplated and longed-for cooperation of the nations in the adjustment and settlement of international disputes without conflict and recourse to war.

To achieve the purposes envisaged by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the conduct of men and nations must accept the sanctions of the ethical law, proclaimed by Judaism as the *sine qua non* for the redemption and salvation of humanity. The bow and the sword and the battle will be banished from the earth, warns the Prophet (Hosea ii: 20-22), only when mankind will become betrothed to God in righteousness and justice, in loving kindness and compassion on faithfulness. These divine attributes, in which man shares, transmute the problem of war and peace into the realm of the ethical principles taught by our prophets, without which an enduring peace is impossible. Nor is a just and enduring peace probable unless it shall be universal. Therefore, the Synagogue Council of America hails the purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to implement the friendly relations among nations with appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace. In due time, these measures should aim to fulfill the vision of the Prophets to bring near the day when swords will be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, when the implements of war will be forged into implements of plenty and of

good for all, when nations shall no more learn the arts of war and the fear of fear shall be banished from among men (Isaiah ii: 4; Micah iv: 3-4).

The Synagogue Council feels, however, that the Dumbarton Oaks document, as did the Covenant of the League of Nations, lacks the prophetic passion to stir and capture the universal spiritual and ethical values inherent in the souls of men. The making of an enduring peace is a challenge to these values. "But the work of righteousness shall be peace," says Isaiah (xxxii: 17), "and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and confidence forever."

The Dumbarton Oaks document provides the machinery for the possible prevention of future wars, not for the establishing of universal peace; proposals for the suppression of international violence after these occur, not for their prevention; a mechanism calculated to rectify and adjudicate international strife, not an instrument to eliminate the bases of strife and violence and war. Unless justice and righteousness are enthroned as the capstone of the aim of any organization that proposes to achieve it, the world can have no hope for an enduring peace. There can be no hope for an enduring peace unless there is a reconversion of the human spirit to the inspired insight of Isaiah that man must work righteousness to earn peace, since only the effect of righteousness can assure to mankind perpetual quietness and confidence.

Peace predicated on such foundations would mean the cessation of the racial or color injustices by which one-third of the world's population, which happens to be white, denies rights and opportunities to the other two-thirds of the population which happens to be black or brown or yellow. It would mean an end to the exploitation of primitive groups by enlightened peoples. It would mean that nations economically disadvantaged are helped to self-improvement and economic reconstruction, even as we bring such aid to the disadvantaged in our own midst. It would mean the spiritual regeneration of the human family to that concept of just and righteous interrelation in which the aggressors within each nation would desist from squeezing and oppressing their neighbors and fellow citizens for their own personal aggrandizement. All the most perfected, practical machinery in the world for maintaining peace will not avail until within men and nations there is created the spirit of the will to peace.

This hope and possibility, one may say, belongs in the realm of religion rather than practical statesmanship. Perhaps what the world suffers from most is a condition in which the prophetic principles do not animate statesmanship. Statesmanship, the Synagogue Council of America holds, must be animated and governed by the great principle first enunciated in the Old Testament (Leviticus 19: 17-18) and then spread the world over through its quotation in the New Testament, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Nonetheless, the Synagogue Council of America welcomes the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference as marking a most significant step forward in human striving to answer the question long ago propounded by the prophet (Malachi 2: 10): "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us all?"

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,  
RABBI HERBERT S. GOLDSTEIN, *President*,  
RABBI AHRON OPHER,  
*Assistant to the President*,  
RABBI ISAAC LANDMAN, *Chairman*,  
RABBI LOUIS FINKELSTEIN,  
RABBI DAVID DE SOLA POOL,  
*Committee on Peace Studies*.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat, reported it on January 20, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 12) thereon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 311. A bill for the relief of Philip Kleinman; without amendment (Rept. No. 13);

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 14);

S. 315. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 317. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 16); and

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; without amendment (Rept. No. 17).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 219. A bill to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 18); and

H. R. 621. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19).

#### AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at half past 3 this afternoon there is to be a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary on a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may file its report during the recess of the Senate, assuming that the Senate takes a recess at the conclusion of the day's work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 350. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Flint; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 351. A bill to promote on the retired list all line officers of the Army who have or may be specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 352. A bill authorizing the State of Minnesota Department of Highways to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Hondros; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. REED:

S. 355. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 356. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by, or against, common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 357. A bill for the relief of the Forward Columbus Fund, of Columbus, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Lisitano; and

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes. This refers to the corporations created by the R. F. C. or under its authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Vermont will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 360. A bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of C. Owen Welch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 362. A bill amending the Fact Finders' Act of 1924 relative to costs of investigations of certain reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 363. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 364. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 365. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; and

S. 366. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 367. A bill to provide for the compilation and publication of a list showing the names and addresses of taxpayers relieved from liability for the payment of taxes under the provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 and the amounts of taxes from which such taxpayers are relieved from liability for payment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 368. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to pro-

mote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, to prohibit the use of any pipe line constructed under such act for the transportation or distribution of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 369. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to overtime pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 370. A bill relating to the hours of employment, compensation, and conditions of employment of employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for such commerce or employed in the performance of any Government contract; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 371. A bill making unlawful the use of force or violence, or threats thereof, to prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 372. A bill granting a pension to Mary Alice Pridgen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'DANIEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 373. A bill to incorporate The Navy Mothers' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 374. A bill to amend the Act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An Act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill 375, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to regulate the use of certain listening devices, and call attention to the fact that a new listening device has been invented which is revolutionary, and under which, without the use of wires, individuals can listen in on a private conversation held as far as 3½ miles away.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 376. A bill to regulate the use of certain listening devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 377. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors in the first- and second-class post offices; and

S. 378. A bill amending sections 7 (a) and 12 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 379. A bill to authorize the presentation of an appropriate medal to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) introduced Senate bill 380, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 381. A bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 382. A bill granting to certain dismissed governmental employees the right to hearings before the Civil Service Committees of Congress; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 383. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural ex-

tension work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 384. A bill to provide for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. RUSHFIELD, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to aid in maintaining agricultural production essential to the prosecution of the war, to clarify the application of existing law relating to the utilization of agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to freedom to work; and

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and wish to make a statement regarding it.

The bill does not create any new agency, but simply recognizes the existence of an existing agency, to wit, the Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 under the Reorganization Act of 1939. It reestablishes that agency, which now is a skeleton agency, since the transfer by the President under the Second War Powers Act under date of February 24, 1942, of most of the agencies and the functions of those agencies theretofore operating under the Federal Loan Agency. The purpose of this bill is to return and restore to the Federal Loan Agency all those agencies and activities which were transferred by Executive order of the President under date of February 24, 1942, to the Department of Commerce.

The bill does not affect the status of the National Housing Agency or of housing agencies which were transferred to the National Housing Agency at the time of the Executive order, nor does the bill deal with the Export-Import Bank, which seems to have been transferred by subsequent Executive act to the F. E. A., and is not now under the Department of Commerce.

Since this bill creates no new agency and does not enlarge the power or responsibility of any of the existing agencies, but merely takes out of the Department of Commerce or from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce all the loaning agencies heretofore transferred to that Department, I think the bill should go to the Committee on Commerce, and I request that it be so referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.



## THE DRAFTING OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, commencing more than 2 years ago, I have repeatedly since called the attention of the Senate to the desperate situation caused by the drafting of farm workers into the service. The Tydings amendment was finally adopted and the situation, to some extent, bettered. So far as I know, nothing was done about the 375,000 able-bodied men who were deferred to take jobs in the Government. The best I could do was to get a list of such individuals sent to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President. In my opinion, thousands of these men occupy places which could be filled by those who are unfit, or who are too old for combat service, and the able-bodied released.

Since the Selective Service has directed local draft boards to send more farm workers, I have been deluged with letters from every section of my State and the Northwest making clear that the taking of additional farm help, in many instances, means that the farmers must quit farming. I ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that the signatures not be printed, because that might prove embarrassing.

There being no objection, the letters, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATHGATE, N. DAK., January 10, 1945.  
Senator LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing with reference to drafting the few men we have left to do the farm work. I am a farmer and do not have any sons to be drafted nor to do my farm work. Therefore I am writing from a production basis.

I farm about 800 acres and hire two men in the summer. If these men are all taken to the Army who is going to do the work? Inexperienced men from the cities and different parts of the country are not capable of running this modern machinery.

As a farmer I want to be patriotic and do my bit for the war effort, but if these farm boys are taken my farm, like many of my neighbors, will have to stand idle and just grow up to weeds.

BLAISDELL, N. DAK., January 12, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: From what we hear over the radio it seems likely that all able-bodied young farmers will be in the Army soon if the military get everything the way they want it.

In my case it means that I shall have to quit farming because I am too old to do much work myself.

I mention this because I know there are thousands of farmers similarly situated.

Older men are going to take charge they say. Where are all those older men we hear so much about? All the older men I know of are overloaded with work now and cannot take on any new jobs.

BUXTON, N. DAK., January 14, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This is the first time in my life I have written to any of our Senators in Washington, but things are pressing us farmers up here in North Dakota, and I am sure it is not new to you.

As I understand, they are to draft our farm boys who are left, and as we have only a little over 200 boys left in II-C class I for one do not feel it quite right.

We have a hard time taking care of our 1944 crop on account of help.

Had we had enough help from the start of harvest we could have saved a lot more of the grain, but as it happened the heavy rains came and lot of the grain is still out in the field. Many of the boys got disgusted and left for their homes down South. If we had had enough help from the start much of this grain could have been saved before the rains.

I hope you will pardon me for writing a rather long letter as I know you are a busy man, but as you are a man from our own State I urge you to do your best for us farmers up here to help keep our boys, who are left, on the farm.

FESSENDEN, N. DAK., January 15, 1945.  
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: Enclosed find two copies of our newspapers.

Why so much confusion in regard to II-C men deferred in agriculture, which are the men we farmers so badly need here in North Dakota. Something should be done to freeze II-C deferments to those that want to be our future farmers, and for the duration. Instead of being batted around within the draft, and out of the draft, and don't know where they are at, to do planning ahead for a successful job on the farm.

Some official and others that put pressure to induct II-C farm workers believe we farmers can use anybody to run our tractors and machinery, which we know cannot be done. Some believe we have too many farm boys deferred, when we know it was the farm boys that were the first to be drafted in North Dakota after those dry years, and besides the farm boys should have same rights as those Federal men and factory workers in defense that are 18 to 26 in deferments, and if it came to the worst, we could get along with a lot less Federal men that are now on the pay rolls.

The farm boys that reach the age of 18 here of late have not had much chance for deferment, which should be considered, and give them an even chance with those drafted in 1942.

## TO EXAMINE ALL II-C MEN

MINOT, N. DAK.—Brig. Gen. Heber L. Edwards, North Dakota director of Selective Service, said here that within the next 60 days, every North Dakota man deferred in class II-C (farm work) and under 26 years of age, will be sent to Fort Snelling, Minn., for preinduction physical examinations under the new regulations.

This does not mean, however, General Edwards added, that every II-C man passing the examination will be inducted.

He came here with other officials from State headquarters in Bismarck for a conference on the new regulations with draft boards from nine counties in the Minot area.

## EXPLAINS NORTH DAKOTA POLICY ON FARM DEFERMENTS

Despite what the headlines may say, the bulk of young men from 18 through 26 deferred for agricultural purposes are not going to be drafted for the Army.

This was the reassuring statement made before the county officers by Lt. Comdr. Frank L. Benson, of the North Dakota selective-service headquarters staff. These young men will be given preinduction physical examinations, but that does not mean they will be called.

The fact that North Dakota has the highest agricultural production per man in the United States, except in Montana, is an indication that this State has no wasted manpower in agriculture, Benson said, pointing out that the selective-service board was interested seeing that agricultural production was maintained.

He said that the nonagricultural group of eligibles in the State had been exhausted,

and that a small percentage of agriculturally deferred men would be taken from some counties, but that the service would try to take those who would hurt farm production the least.

Lieutenant Commander Benson urged all to cooperate with local boards in trying to find out which would be best spared from agricultural work. He said that farming was defense work, in the eyes of Selective Service, and that the man on the farm had as good a chance at deferment as one who went west to work in a bomber plant.

ROGERS, N. DAK., January 13, 1945.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regard to the drafting of farm labor. I think the Government is making a grave mistake in taking the boys from the lower-age brackets from the farms.

To cite my own case. We have 430 acres. Last year we raised 170 hogs, sold \$1,200 worth of cattle, and around 2,000 bushels of wheat. This year we are keeping 15 brood sows and 60 head of cattle, 20 of which are cows and heifers which will increase our herd this year. Included in this are 6 milk cows.

Except for a month and a half in harvest and threshing when we had the help of one man, our only boy, 23 years of age, has done practically all the work, as I am 70 years of age, and physically unable because of a bad heart condition, to do anything except the lightest work. My wife has been crippled with arthritis for 3 years and is unable to do her housework.

I had my farm loan renewed in 1933 to the amount of \$8,000, and owing to the condition of crops and prices, interest and taxes, increased it to \$12,000. During the last 3 years we have paid off \$6,000 of this loan (a Federal loan) besides paying some feed and seed loans. We have also subscribed to our quota of bonds and all other war drives in our community.

If this boy is taken, our farm would lie idle, as there would be no one I could get to take his place. I am personally acquainted with five other farmers (all older men like myself) in our township, who are faced with the same situation as I, and who have one boy in the 18-25 age group, with no other help.

Please give this matter your consideration, for if these younger farm boys are taken, the output of food would be drastically reduced. Thank you.

ASHLEY, N. DAK., January 13, 1945.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am sending you this newspaper clipping so you can see what is going on at home.

When I read it I wondered if this is our pay-off from our Government for the work that we farmers did. For our boys on the fronts and for our Government that they want all our young boys from the farms and put them in the Army. So other young boys can play football, basketball, and boxing matches. I heard a boxing match this evening on the radio again.

Someone told me that a high officer made this statement in Ashley lately. We have to draft the farm boys now to get them. We can't draft them in March.

Are we farmers still recognized in Washington as on essential jobs or not? It don't look like it here at home. It looks very bad for us right now.

I hope you can do something for us farmers real soon.

[From the Ashley (N. Dak.) Tribune of January 11, 1945]

WILL CALL FARMERS FOR PREPHYSICAL Reorganization of the McIntosh County Local Selective Service Board took place Monday, due to the resignation of Ed. Herr, of

Wishek. Otto Brandt, of Wishek, was named in his place. The board now includes Jacob Remper, chairman; Fred Breitmeyer, vice chairman, and Otto Brandt, secretary.

Lt. Comdr. Frank L. Bensen, Bismarck, occupational adviser of State headquarters of Selective Service, met with the local board here Monday to acquaint them with some of the new regulations.

According to Lieutenant Commander Bensen, the new regulations provide that all farm boys under the age of 26 will be called for a preinduction physical examination. This will take place soon—within a period of about 6 weeks. He stated, however, that farmers should not become too alarmed and assured us that this does not mean that all farmers will be taken out of their agricultural classification, but that the purpose is to find out how many are qualified for military service and to get a check on the available manpower.

Regardless of what happens, it is nevertheless true that the armed services are in need of more men due to our expanding war fronts in the Pacific and in Europe. This need must be met. For that reason we needn't try to fool ourselves—many more men will have to be drafted, since there are not going to be enough boys turning 18 to meet the heavy demand.

BINFORD, N. DAK., January 8, 1945.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILLIAM LANGER: Your kind and considerate communications of January 2 and 3 at hand, for which we sincerely thank you.

We would like to have more information regarding the Tydings amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. Is not this amendment in effect (just as much now) to protect the farmer if he is within the bounds of this amendment?

The local board fully agreed that we were in strict accord with the terms of the Tydings amendment. Can either of these boys be legally deprived of their deferred status when they are in strict accord with the amendment?

Grain farming differs from dairy farming in that it can be layed down for a year, and the next spring the farmer can go out and plant a crop. In 3 or 4 months he will have raised a crop. But a dairy farmer who has disposed of his cows cannot build up his herd in any less time than 3 years, and for that reason we believe that the dairy farmer should be spared in preference to the grain farmer.

Any information that you can give us on this matter will be very much appreciated, and thanking you for an early reply, I am,

SAWYER, N. DAK., January 13, 1945.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being a farmer for 40 years, I am very much interested in the new draft regulation.

It's been almost impossible to farm the last year with what farmers we did have left and if they take any more there will be many farms standing vacant.

There is a farm within a mile of me that has been vacated by the owner for lack of competent farm help. It's a well improved farm with \$4,000 improvements and a section of land. The owner tried to farm it after his last boy on the farm was drafted last May. He had one of the best dairy herds around here, but as he was 65 years old and in poor health, he couldn't do the work and had a sale last November and went to California. Since then and probably through the duration this farm will lay idle.

On this farm was 20 acres of crested wheat grass that was never cut which would have made 200 pounds of seed per acre if it had been harvested.

It's my opinion if they take more farm boys and try to replace them with IV-F or other hired help, who are not interested in the place, and who are not willing to work 12 to 16 hours every day like the farm boys do themselves, there will be many more farms standing idle.

We had a good crop in this part of the country last year and most of it was harvested. In my estimation, 10 to 20 percent had gone back into the ground for lack of help and combines.

There were hundreds of tons of wild hay that wasn't cut in this part of the country, although many of the farmers put up hay as late as the last of November.

To me the farm situation looks very serious and the present administration will find it out when it's too late.

I am Wayne Morey's father and Wayne failed to pass the physical examination and is in class IV-F. For the last 2 years he has been working in the Kaiser shipyards in Vancouver, Wash. I also have a married son who farms for himself. Then I have one 20-year-old son at home who is running this farm with my advice and help. Last year we milked 16 cows and had 350 acres of crop in. If my son is taken into the Army I'll have to quit farming, as my health is very poor and I am not able to do the work myself.

My reason for writing this letter was to let you know the exact condition in this part of the State, and I know you will be interested in knowing these facts.

ZAP, N. DAK., January 6, 1945.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am herewith writing this letter concerning my son, the only boy that I have that can help me on the farm. They are trying to induct him the 15th of January. I am unable to see at times, as I have only one good eye and have an infection on that eye. I am farming 250 acres and milk 24 cows. The total number of cattle that we have to feed during the winter is 46 head.

The oldest boy that I have at home is only 14 years old and is still going to school. If they take Oscar into the Army then I don't know what I am going to do with the farm. I have one boy in the Army already for more than 2 years.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., January 6, 1945.  
WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Once again the administration wants to take our young farmers into the Army, because of a so-called manpower shortage, and still they want us to produce more foodstuffs. As a citizen of North Dakota and in draft age myself, I for one expect you, as well as our other representatives, to oppose this move to the best of your ability.

While I am over 26 years my parents are both over 70, so if I, like hundreds of others, were taken the farming would be discontinued.

I write this letter to you so as you can find out the opinion of one farmer anyway. Although I know of many similar cases right in my own township.

If this ever comes on the floor of the Senate, as a bill, I for one will look to you to oppose the drafting of any more farm workers, regardless of age.

SYKESTON, N. DAK., January 15, 1945.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: Am writing to you in regard to the draft.

Am hearing over the radio that they will draft the IV-F's for war work. They are doing it already; and not only that, they are

taking the last boy away from the farm where the old man is not able to do the work. I know of a few where this happened, and others have not been called on yet so far. Wish you would look into this matter and if this draft of farm boys keeps up there will be hundreds of acres not put in and you can look for a food shortage of everything.

And all the boo-hoo about the labor shortage in the war plants is not labor—it's the 10 percent, as I talked with some that work there. They say it is not work as on the farms; they work from 6½ to 8 hours, but on the farm it's 12 to 18 hours a day and no time and one-half for overtime.

I think the best the War Labor Board can do is to investigate the war plants and let the workers work 12 hours a day and not 6½ to 8, and they have one-third more men to do the work. That's what we have to do on the farm—and have to get it done in time, too.

LEMMON, S. DAK., January 12, 1945.  
MR. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm afraid we are headed for trouble again and this is the reason why:

The draft board has sent questionnaires out to everyone eligible in the county and we hear they do not plan on deferring a single farm boy, and if they take our son, Vernon, who you so kindly got discharged a year ago last November, we will have to quit farming, sell all of the cattle—although we could milk 26 head in spring if we could get the help to do so—and move to town. As I wrote you, mister's health is none too good and I am diabetic, so where would we be.

If the draft board takes him again please advise what can be done and how to do it, and I'll be so grateful to you and what you did in the past will never be forgotten.

Expect to hear from the draft board somewhere near the middle of the week, so am sending this air mail and sending an air mail stamped envelope for reply. Again I thank you for a reply.

RYDER, N. DAK., December 28, 1944.  
Senator W. LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing to you about trying to get my boy deferred.

He has been married 4 years and has two children. The 2 first years he was married he worked on the farm, and in the fall he got a job in a creamery, and then he was frozen there for some time, but he came to help me in his spare time, like in the evenings and on Sunday. Then he was put in II-C and deferred for farm work last summer, so he moved back to the farm and has been helping me ever since.

I have rented everything to him, because I have not been able to do my own work by myself for the last 2 years; have been under the doctor's care all the time.

I have a doctor's statement at the draft board in Minot, but they don't pay no attention to it, and he is due to be called most any time, as he has been put back in I-A.

Help is so hard to get, and we only have the one boy, and it is hard to do without him when farm work is so important to help win this war we all are trying to fight.

Mr. LANGER, you have helped us before, when times were hard and we could not work it out by ourselves, and I am asking you for your help again, as I need it as bad now as I did before.

Write at once and let me know what to do.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., January 19, 1945.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing you about the draft taking all of our farm boys. You know the conditions here in the Northwest as well as anybody else, and that when it breaks up in the spring we have got only a



short time to get our crops in if we expect to get a crop at all. And in order to do that we have got to have help we can depend on to go ahead and do their stuff, and there is just no substitute for the boy that has been born and raised on the farm. He knows his machinery and he knows the lay of the land. He knows where he can go with a tractor and where he cannot.

My experience with inexperienced help is, they spend most of their time in a mud hole somewhere, burning up a lot of our much-needed gas and getting nowhere. Now, we have a boy 23 years old that, after keeping company with a girl for 4 years, was married last summer and is living on our farm, which consists of about 1,600 acres, rented land and all. My wife and I moved to town last fall and she is operating a rooming house, and I spend a good share of my time helping the boy on the farm.

We aim to keep around 100 head of cattle, of which 30 are milk cows, and along with the hogs, sheep, and poultry gives us plenty to do. We have on the average 600 acres of small grain. The boy got his notice to go to Fort Snelling for his examination, so he went last Tuesday and passed; so the local board says now if he gets a card stating he is in I-A he had better get ready to go, as they have no authority to defer him.

That means he will have to sell off his stock and farming equipment and I will have to reduce mine, as I have been handicapped with a stiff leg for the last 20 years and am crowding the 60 mark. Am still able to do a lot of work, but there are certain things I cannot do. I don't like to quit farming now, as I know we have all got to do all we can to win the war, and if our boys have got to go over there and fight, give them all the eats and help we can; but we can only do so much. We only have two boys, and the youngest enlisted in the Navy 2 years ago.

A bad year with a large acreage there is still a little surplus left, but a bad year with a small acreage it takes it all for seed and feed.

In closing, I hope the officials can see before it is too late and leave us some good help on the farms.

FARGO, N. DAK., January 9, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Farm boys as ready and willing to serve in armed forces as any group. Many were deferred because of absolute need of maximum production. Now if armed forces need men more than maximum production, Congress must decide. The farm-labor situation is acute and production will be cut if large numbers of farm youths are called. Their need cannot be replaced by transient labor, older men, or young boys.

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE  
MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: American dairy farmers are worried over the recent directive for the reclassification and induction of farm youths in the 18-25 age group. They are fearful that in many instances local draft boards will be stampeded into overlooking the provisions in the present law which exempts essential agricultural workers from military service.

If because of this oversight, or because of an abandonment of present standards of deferment, the dairy industry is to be further drained of essential workers, it will irreparably cripple our efforts which last year produced 20,000,000,000 pounds of milk products for the armed forces and our allies and cared

for our civilian needs as well. A full-scale drafting of workers in the 18-25 age class from dairy farms would cut 1945 milk production by as much as 5,000,000,000 pounds.

No segment of American agriculture is more hard pressed by manpower shortages than the dairy industry. Milk producers cannot depend on prisoners, imported labor, or unskilled workers. The implication that food production can be left entirely to older men, and to women, is entirely unwarranted in the dairy field. The brunt of the heaviest farm work is borne by younger men—which alone makes possible the fullest utilization of the energies of women, children, and older men in lighter tasks.

We present these facts for your information. Army spokesmen have told us that at no time have their working inventories of dairy products been as high as they had hoped. We submit that our wartime efforts should not be further crippled. We ask your influence in this behalf.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., January 8, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We are very much alarmed at recent reclassification and induction into military service of farm boys in 18 to 26 age group. There may be areas where surplus of farm labor still exists; however, North Dakota has long ago scraped the bottom of its agricultural manpower barrel for military service if maximum food production is as vitally imperative as is indicated by food goals established for 1945 by the War Food Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture.

We believe maximum output from our farms to be of equal importance in winning the war with maximum output from our mines, factories, and shipyards; particularly is this true if there are to be several more years of war. Additionally, this war is being fought to destroy the totalitarian ideology of fascism. The destruction of fascism is the major prerequisite to building for our people and the people of the world a decent peace under which the will of people may be expressed and their needs may be served through governments and economic systems of their own choice. For these reasons the winning of the war and the peace must be an inseparable process. With few exceptions the induction of North Dakota farm boys between the ages of 18 and 26 means an inevitable reduction of our food production from the maximum which effective prosecution of this war and the establishment of a lasting peace will require.

WALHALLA, N. DAK., January 5, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.:

If present production to be maintained everything possible must be done to have farm laborers deferred.

BUXTON, N. DAK., January 15, 1945.

HON. SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Have been reading in the papers and hearing across the radio that all the farm boys and others are going to be drafted in the near future. If that is the case what are we older fellows going to do with so much crop to put in and other work to be done on the farm? It just can't be done. If they want food for our fighting men I can't see that they can take farmers especially when there is only one in the family and one that has never been off the farm, either for any school or anything else, as that has been his only ambition. If there is anything you could do in this matter in the near future or as soon as possible as the II-C's are coming up

now, it would be surely appreciated, and we look to you as our Senator to be of some help to us here in this matter. Thanking you for what you can do.

ECKELSON, N. DAK., January 12, 1945.  
SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the farm-labor situation. We would like to tell you that if they take our boys away we would have to leave our farm, as Mr. — has a bad heart ailment and can do no heavy work. Now we farm a lot of land and have a large herd of cattle and quite a few hogs, and milk quite a few cows. I wish you would try and do something about it. Last year help was so scarce. There is no man that will come and take charge of chores, and so forth, or even help with them, beside all the other farm work involved to produce a crop, like our own boys would. Please consider this and oblige. I have only three boys in for 3 years now.

HATTON, N. DAK., January 16, 1945.

MR. WILLIAM LANGER.  
DEAR SIR: I have confidence in you Mr. LANGER—and have always admired your work, therefore, I am bringing my problem to you, hoping you can do something about it.

I am farming 2 quarters of land (320 acres) which I bought in 1943. My son and I have been farming it since; I could not get along without him, because I am not in such a good condition as I used to be. I'm 54 and my son is 23. Last fall my son went to the draft board to find out if it was all right to rent some land on his own so he rented 240 acres more, and has bought tractor and machinery, and we plan to do all this together, but if they're going to draft him, I will never be able to farm my own land, saying nothing about his, which has already been contracted.

There are several cases just like this one around here. Last fall when we threshed we couldn't get any help, and we had to use bull rakes and push it to the machine, I pitched alone because we were so short-handed. If he went and if they take the other deferred boys, there is no one who can replace them, because there is no one to hire, and wages are outrageous.

Please do what you can. There won't be enough food at all—if this happens.

Thank you.

P. S.—Please do not publish this, or let my name be known to anyone but yourself.

BISBEE, N. DAK., January 16, 1945.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER:  
I am alarmed at the draft of farm boys that we hear so much about on the radio and read about in the newspapers. I was just listening to the radio and heard General Hershey say that they were going to take all farm boys regardless of deferments. I want to say right now, that it just means the end to family-type farming. I further want to state that we are just going to fold up and quit farming. We will be unable to carry on. I know several farmers that are going to do the same thing. So if General Hershey wants to see the farmer out of business, all he has to do is go ahead and draft these boys and he will see a farm panic.

ALFRED, N. DAK., January 4, 1945.  
SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am going to write to you, and would like to know what you can do about farmers being called into the Army. I have been on the farm all my life. Now I've been reclassified in I-A and also am called to get my preinduction physical examination.

Here is my standing: I am farming 3 1/4 quarters of land of which 225 acres is cropland. I have 12 head of dairy cows, 12 head of young dairy cattle, 38 head of sheep (ewes), 7 horses, and a complete set of farm machinery. I bought my farm a year and a half ago. If drafted in the Army, I would have to give up my farm, lose the payments I've made. There is also no market for horses or machinery in the middle of the winter.

I am married, have no children, but my wife expects a baby sometime in February. There are still single men of draft age. I cannot see why I should be forced off the farm, when I'm doing essential work in agriculture. Please try and do something about the matter. I am going to have my physical examination on or after January 9, 1945.

JANUARY 8, 1945.

SENATOR LANGER: I see in the paper that they are going to draft farmers. If they do that, they will not need much food for 1945. My boy is in draft age, and if they draft him there will not be much food produced on that farm. My boy is all alone on the farm. He owns eight cows, eight young stock, besides two horses, chickens, and pigs. He is the only boy I got. He is married and got one child. I know you have been a good friend to the working class and I know you will see that the farmers will keep on producing the food.

Mr. LANGER, I am too old to work like the younger ones do. I am over 68 years old and not very strong. I live in town. I hope you will do all you can to keep the boy farming.

GRANDIN, N. DAK., January 12, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a clipping from the Hillsboro Banner, Traill County, N. Dak. I am a farmer and have an only son in the draft age. I also have several neighbors in the same fix as I am. I like to do my part, but where are we going to get help to replace these boys that are worth five inexperienced hands? Can you help us figure the answer? Thanks for any information or help we may get.

TRAILL GETS LARGE CALL FOR II-C EXAMS—MANY 18-26 FARM DEFERRED YOUNG MEN GO TO SNELLING JANUARY 26

Concrete evidence that steps are being taken to process youth of the county, deferred in the past for farm work, and prepare an increasing number for possible induction, was offered Monday morning when the Traill County selective-service board received instructions to send an additional number of registrants to Fort Snelling, Minn., for preinduction physical examinations.

The call is scheduled for January 27 and was for a very large number, the board disclosed. Those to be sent in addition to the regular January call for preinduction are now classed II-C in the draft and are between the ages of 18 and 26. The regular monthly contingent of preinduction physicals left Wednesday. There were 16 in the call.

The II-C draft class is the only remaining one in this county in which there is an appreciable number of men under 26. Last week the State selective-service office said Traill County has 226 young men in the class. The problem of determining which of the 226 are to go to Fort Snelling for their examinations is one with which the county board will wrestle this week. The men can be selected by order number or by other means. Whether they can be deferred after receiving their physicals is open to question.

The need for younger fighting men has been evident for sometime, and the present critical situation on the western front has accelerated the demand. Draft calls have been stepped up, and if the II-C group does

not yield the necessary number, older men will have to be requisitioned.

Leaving January 16 for induction are these men:

Edgar Haugstad and Albert Smith, of Cummings; Harry T. Anderson, Robert Koering, and Robert Hutchison, of Hillsboro; Ralph Chandler, of Caledonia; LeRoy Guttormson, of Portland; Wendell Thorstad, of Clifford; and Robert Hanson, of Hatton.

Marcus A. Evans, of Mayville, has volunteered and will leave soon for specialized training in the Navy.

PEKIN, N. DAK., January 4, 1945.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enjoyed your speech last night over the radio, and I trust you will urge Congress and the Selective Service heads to leave the necessary farm workers on the farms, and especially where many families have only one boy, or one boy left, as most of us farmers are getting on the old side of life and simply cannot run our farms and produce to full capacity without efficient help. It seems reasonable where a farmer is over 55 years old and has a full line of equipment and farming over 200 acres of land, raising cattle, etc., he should be able to keep his own son on the farm, especially when that son does a big share of the work.

Many hundreds of farmers have quit farming on account of inefficient help, and if more farm boys are taken there will be more farms left idle and our country will run into a food shortage. Please do what you can.

DICKINSON, N. DAK.

WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: We were at a meeting in South Dickinson when your speech came over the radio, and we are all for your plans for North Dakota, especially in keeping our young men here—the few that are left. According to the population of North Dakota, we think we have more men in the service than any other State in the Union. The classified ad sections in the newspapers out here are getting crowded with ads of farms for sale, and most everyone wants to sell on account of not having help enough to farm any more. This fall we worked in the harvest fields from 14 to 16 hours a day, then went home at night to do chores—and at that there still are crops to thresh in some parts of the country.

Roosevelt wants us to produce more foodstuffs in 1945. How will we be able to do it if we have to give the rest of our manpower to the armed forces? North Dakota is left out in the cold as far as war plants are concerned, so we have to produce all the foodstuffs we can, but if they take much more of our help we will not be able to do that.

FARGO, N. DAK., January 15, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I am writing you concerning the latest draft order. I have 2 sons of draft age. One is married and has 1 child, farming 440 acres in the Red River Valley, milking 10 cows, has 50 head of ewes to lamb, a large flock of laying hens, and will have some sows this spring. He lost his 1944 crop by water, and to buy feed and live has been compelled to work out, too, this winter, but lives on the farm, doing his chores and then full-time work. No hired man or war prisoner would do anything like that.

The other son is farming 400 acres of land, living at home; has had a fine purebred herd of milking Shorthorns for 7 years, and has just spent \$1,000 for new blood in his herd. He has done all the field work for the past 6 years as I am not able to do so. I am not able to keep up the work he has been

doing, and my chores if he is taken and no help can be secured to do the work now—dependable help.

A neighbor who farms 320 acres lost his crop with water and in order to live and heed the cry for help he arranged his work at home and got a job in a war plant for the winter. He has been called for his medical.

Two other neighbor boys are farming 400 acres; raise a large number of cattle and hogs; the third boy is in service. Their widowed mother keeps house for them. They are within the age limit. These are a few instances of farm boys who are in this latest draft, and what will happen if it is followed up? No hired man or war prisoner would put in 16 or 18 hours a day in the field and watch a sick cow that night, or a farrowing sow, or get up two or three times a night to look after a brooder fire, or work until midnight to finish a job of haying, and be on the job next morning ready for work, or run a corn picker all night because the mud had thawed out during the day.

There are hundreds of other farm boys in similar positions. The dairy industry has suffered from lack of help. The grain and livestock end will be hard hit as well. The few boys left on the farms must stay there or there will be a decrease in farm production during 1945. This spring will be doubly hard for all on account of the condition of the fields from excess moisture.

You are a Senator of North Dakota and know the conditions here, and we are asking you to exert every effort to keep the essential farm boys on the farm.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have prepared a joint resolution, which I shall now introduce, which is as follows:

Whereas previous directives of the Selective Service apparently have misled boards into inducing farm workers that are desperately needed upon the farms and have either ignored or twisted beyond all understanding the Tydings amendment for draft deferment of farm workers; and

Whereas the Nation's farm population has declined by approximately 5,000,000 even before the ambiguous directives the local boards have received which were sent out by the Selective Service: Be it

Resolved, etc.—1. That the Selective Service is hereby directed to clarify its directives on the drafting of farm workers;

2. That there be a reclassification for the availability into the armed service of the 3,300,783 Federal employees;

3. That farming be declared to be a critical war industry;

4. That pending the investigation as to why the Tydings amendment of the Selective Service has not been carried out, that the deferment of all farm workers between the ages of 18 and 35, inclusive, be deferred.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the joint resolution I introduced this morning dealing with the matter of directing General Hershey to clarify the directive he issued on the Tydings amendment. My reason is that after offering the resolution I found that a joint resolution had been introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] in behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. I withdraw my resolution and join with these Senators in the introduction of their joint resolution so that there will be one less measure to consider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution re-



ferred to by the Senator from North Dakota is withdrawn.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was referred to the Committee on Rules.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION RELATING TO DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. For the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and myself I submit a resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make an inquiry into the present production and supply and distribution of dairy products. I should like briefly to explain my reason for offering the resolution.

I am offering this simple resolution directing the Committee on Agriculture to make an inquiry into the production, transportation, and distribution of dairy products because of an event which has occurred and which may conceivably affect every farmer in the United States who uses mechanical equipment on his farm. I refer to the secondary boycott called by Local 680 of the teamsters union against the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm, of Plainsboro, N. J.

The controversy between the teamsters union and the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm began some months ago, when the union undertook to organize the employees of Walker-Gordon.

In response to a telegram from Mr. Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, as to whether the union was undertaking to organize farm labor, Mr. Thomas E. Flynn, acting president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, replied under date of August 7, 1944, to the effect that the union had no intention of organizing farmers or farm workers, that they had accepted 65 of the 260 employees of the Walker-Gordon Co. as members of their union, and put forth the claims that these employees were industrial dairy employees as they were operators of mechanical milking machines.

It would appear that inasmuch as the teamsters' union was unsuccessful in organizing the employees of the Walker-Gordon Farm, it resorted to a secondary boycott of the products of the farm, and since January 9, 1945, members of the teamsters' union have been forbidden to handle the milk produced on the Walker-Gordon Farm. According to news reports, this amount to 23,000 quarts a day. I understand it is all certified milk, and a large percentage of it is sold to hospitals and on doctors' prescription in New York City and vicinity.

I further understand that at present the milk is being skimmed and the cream held at the farm, because no member of

the teamsters' union is permitted to deliver it anywhere.

I hold no brief for the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm. I know very little about them. Possibly their employees should be organized. I realize that corporation farms are very attractive to union organizers and will probably become more so. What concerns me is the claim of the teamsters' union that dairymen who operate mechanical milking machines are industrial employees. If a precedent to this effect is set as a result of the Walker-Gordon boycott, and such precedent upheld, it would mean that several hundred thousand dairy farms in the United States could be forced to become members of and pay dues to the teamsters' union in order to get their milk delivered to the market.

In my small State of Vermont alone, this would mean that at the rate of \$2 per month per member, the farmers might be required to pay over \$500,000 a year in dues to the teamsters' union in order to market their milk. Throughout the country the total would amount to millions of dollars.

What concerns me further is a report which came to me yesterday that the teamsters' union had demanded of the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm that not only should the operators of the milking machines be required to join the union, but all employees of the farm, regardless of their duties, should be required to become union members.

On getting this report, I telegraphed Mr. Henry Jeffers, president of the Walker-Gordon Farm, asking if it were true. I received a telegram stating that the report was true; that the only employees to be exempted from union membership would be nonworking supervisors.

It is my opinion that if Mr. Jeffers requires his employees to become union members when only 25 percent of them have signified their willingness to do so, he would very definitely be violating the labor laws of the country.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to believe that if operators of milking machines on farms are adjudged to be industrial employees, then operators of other machines, such as combines, mechanical cotton pickers, and orchard sprayers, would also be classed as industrial employees.

It is conceivable that this might lead to a situation whereby almost any and every farmer could be forced to pay dues to the teamsters union in order to get his products to market.

The situation is so serious that it merits the immediate attention of the Congress, and for that reason I am offering this resolution in the hope that a thorough investigation may be made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the facts ascertained before it is too late.

It is bad enough to have 23,000 quarts of high-grade milk withheld from the New York market. It would be infinitely worse to have a general conflict between labor and agriculture, although I cannot conceive of labor in general supporting the reported contentions of the teamsters union. It is a matter in which every labor organization, every

farmer, and every consumer should be immediately concerned.

There is little time to lose in getting at the facts of this unfortunate situation which exists in New Jersey. We may have only a matter of hours in which to act.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) submitted by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. HAWKES) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and inquiry into the present production and supply of dairy products and the transportation and distribution thereof, and into the laws, regulations, and orders of the War Food Administration, with a view to ascertaining among other things whether the present laws are adequate to permit the War Food Administration to take any and all action that may be necessary to prevent waste and spoilage in the production, transportation, and distribution of such dairy products. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with recommendations as it deems advisable.

HOWARD B. SMITH

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That notwithstanding the limit of expenditures contained in Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 9, 1943 (authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act), as modified by Senate Resolution 238, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate to Howard B. Smith, the sum of \$2,805 as compensation for stenographic services rendered to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting and transcribing hearings held before such committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV RESPECTING INVESTIGATIONS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"4. Each of the several standing committees of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall have the authority to make investigations and conduct studies of any and all matters within the jurisdiction of the committee or which are germane to any matters which have been referred to the committee or which the committee may determine will be of assistance in the performance of its functions and duties; and, in the exercise of such authority, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable; and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall

not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"6. No resolution calling for the establishment of a special or select committee of the Senate shall be considered by the Senate unless there is no standing committee of the Senate whose jurisdiction extends to the subject matter of the investigation or study proposed to be made by such special or select committee."

#### AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 9 RELATING TO EXPENSES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 9, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1945, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the total expenses of each standing committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, in connection with the performance of its duties and functions under paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, shall be limited as follows: For the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, \$50,000; for the Committee on Appropriations, \$150,000; for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, \$ ; for the Committee on Banking and Currency, \$50,000; for the Committee on Civil Service, \$ ; for the Committee on Claims, \$ ; for the Committee on Commerce, \$50,000; for the Committee on the District of Columbia, \$ ; for the Committee on Education and Labor, \$ ; for the Committee on Enrolled Bills, \$ ; for the Committee on Finance, \$50,000; for the Committee on Foreign Relations, \$50,000; for the Committee on Immigration, \$ ; for the Committee on Indian Affairs, \$ ; for the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, \$ ; for the Committee on Interstate Commerce, \$50,000; for the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, \$ ; for the Committee on the Judiciary, \$50,000; for the Committee on the Library, \$ ; for the Committee on Manufactures, \$ ; for the Committee on Military Affairs, \$50,000; for the Committee on Mines and Mining, \$ ; for the Committee on Naval Affairs, \$50,000; for the Committee on Patents, \$ ; for the Committee on Pensions, \$ ; for the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, \$ ; for the Committee on Printing, \$ ; for the Committee on Privileges and Elections, \$ ; for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, \$ ; for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, \$ ; for the Committee on Rules, \$ ; for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, \$ : *Provided*, That the limitation herein set forth may be increased, at the request of any standing committee, by such sum or sums as may be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate."

#### INVESTIGATION CONCERNING FERTILIZERS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the supply, production, distribution, and sale of fertilizers for agricultural purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and

investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CONSERVATION OF WILD-ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a special committee to investigate the conservation of wild-animal life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$13,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose.

#### CONSIDERATION OF AGRICULTURE AS A CRITICAL WAR INDUSTRY

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, sent out a directive on Wednesday, January 3, 1945, to the State directors and the local draft boards throughout the Nation; and

Whereas said directive is interpreted by most of the draft boards and State directors as a directive to take the farm workers who are physically qualified without regard to the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas the War Food Administrator has said, in reference to his statement quoted in the directive, that it was his intention to refer only to such farm labor as is not deferred by the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas under this directive all farm workers aged 18 through 25 in class II-C, except those previously disqualified, are ordered "to report for preinduction physical examination"; and

Whereas evidence has been placed before the Congress that same local draft boards have interpreted this directive as a Presidential order for both examination and immediate induction, and not subject to appeal thus in effect nullifying the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas farm boys are patriotic and if called for induction will not willingly apply for deferment, even though the need for their services may be greater on the farms than elsewhere; and

Whereas the farm owners and employers of farm labor have no way of knowing whether the workers called for preexamination will be physically qualified or disqualified; and

Whereas they know that if they are physically qualified, they will be immediately inducted into the armed forces, and as a result, therefore, auction sales are being held throughout the Nation disposing of livestock, poultry, and farm machinery and thousands of farms are either being abandoned or farm operations curtailed because there is no available farm help for replacement; and

Whereas this threat to the Nation's food supply has aroused the country to the danger of a shortage of food not only for our armed forces but for the civilian workers; and

Whereas there is already a severe shortage of butter, milk, cheese, and other dairy products and also of meat and meat products, in spite of unusually favorable weather conditions, resulting in the greatest crops in our history; and

Whereas there are 3,300,783 in Government employment, and since there are great inconsistencies and contradictions in the governmental statistics in regard to deferments, and since Senator BYRD states that there are at least several hundred thousand unnecessary Federal employees; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that there are millions of hoarded workers in the cost-plus and other industrial plants; and

Whereas there are over 4,500,000 of the armed forces still in continental United States; and

Whereas the necessary replacements in our present armed forces are less than 800,000 per annum: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Director of Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to comply with the intent and spirit, as well as with the letter, of the Tydings amendment, and he is directed to consider agriculture as a critical war industry, and that farm help be deferred in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings amendment wherever it is shown that it is essential for agricultural production; be it further.

*Resolved*, That the Director of Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to immediately issue a clarifying directive to all State directors and local draft boards in accordance with this resolution; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Director of War Mobilization direct the War Manpower Commission to immediately investigate the availability of manpower among the 3,300,783 Federal employees, and especially to make a thorough investigation in regard to labor hoarding in industry, and particularly so in the cost-plus war industries, in order that all essential labor in every critical industry may be treated alike; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be directed and authorized immediately to determine the effect of the State director advice No. 288, released January 3, 1945, upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Senate within 5 days.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### GUARANTY OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AT STANDARD WAGES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "No Democratic Government Can Guarantee Full-Time Employment at Standard Wages" delivered by him to the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, on January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICA'S WAR AND PEACE AIMS— ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's war and peace aims delivered by



him before America's Town Meeting of the Air in New York on January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

**TIME TO TAKE STOCK—ADDRESS BY  
ALF M. LANDON**

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Time To Take Stock" delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Topeka, Kans., before the annual meeting of the junior chamber of commerce in Cleveland, Ohio, January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

**COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—AD-  
DRESS BY BRIG. GEN. ALBERT L.  
COX**

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on compulsory military training delivered by Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox at the Central High School in Washington on January 18, 1945, under the auspices of the Parent-Teachers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SIX FULL DAYS' WORK EVERY WEEK—  
PLAN OF KIWANIS CLUB OF WEST  
POINT, VA.**

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a plan to regulate full-time work in essential industry by every available person, proposed by the Kiwanis Club of West Point, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

**TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR BRICKER, OF  
OHIO—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUM-  
BUS SUNDAY DISPATCH**

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Outstanding Governor Retires," from the Columbus Dispatch of Sunday, January 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

**POSTMASTER, MOUNT VERNON, MO.**

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report favorably the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo., in place of Robert Stemmons, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of this postmaster nomination, in which the President of the Senate is interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the confirmation of a postmaster nomination?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, as in executive session.

Mr. WHITE. Has the nomination been reported from the committee, and is it on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the nomination?

Mr. McKELLAR. The nomination was just read at the desk. I ask that it again be read for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk again read the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

**NATIONAL POLICY AND PROGRAM FOR  
CONTINUING FULL EMPLOYMENT**

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself, a bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government.

This bill offers a fundamental method of attacking America's No. 1 post-war problem: that of assuring post-war jobs for the people of our country.

I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD, and that a series of questions and answers which I have prepared in explanation of the bill be printed following the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. O'MAHONEY), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,*

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Full Employment Act of 1945."

**DECLARATION OF POLICY**

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that—  
(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

(c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full em-

ployment be maintained in the United States;

(d) In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure;

(e) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and

(f) Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

**THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT  
BUDGET**

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "National Budget"), which shall set forth in summary and detail for the ensuing fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate—

(1) the estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture;

(2) the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, required to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will be necessary to provide employment opportunities for such labor force (such dollar volume being hereinafter referred to as the "full employment volume of production"); and

(3) the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government (not taking into account any increased or decreased investment or expenditure which might be expected to result from the programs set forth in such Budget).

The estimates and information herein called for shall take account of such foreign investments and expenditure for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

(b) The extent, if any, by which the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is less than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, shall for the purposes of this title be regarded as a prospective deficiency in the National Budget. When there is a prospective deficiency in the National Budget for any fiscal year or other period, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise, as will prevent such deficiency to the greatest possible extent. The President shall also include in such Budget such recommendations for legislation relating to such program as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program may include, but need not be limited to, current and projected Federal policies and activities with reference to banking and currency, monopoly and competition, wages and

working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure.

(c) To the extent, if any, that such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure as may be expected to result from actions taken under the program set forth in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are deemed insufficient to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as will be sufficient to bring the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local government, and the Federal Government, up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production. Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any of such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law.

(d) If the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is more than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

(e) The programs referred to in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to assure that monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolistic practices, will not interfere with the achievement of the purposes of this act.

(f) The National Budget shall include a report on the distribution of the national income during the preceding fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, together with an evaluation of the effect upon the distribution of the national income of the programs set forth in such Budget.

(g) The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

#### PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) The National Budget shall be prepared in the Executive Office of the President under the general direction and supervision of the President, and in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments.

(b) The President shall transmit to the several departments and establishments such preliminary estimates and other information as will enable them to prepare such plans and programs as may be needed during the ensuing or subsequent fiscal years to help achieve a full employment volume of production.

(c) The President may establish such advisory boards or committees composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, and others, as he may deem advisable for the purpose of

advising and consulting on methods of achieving the objectives of this act.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Labor, and Ways and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this act; and

(2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena, or to testify when summoned, under authority of this section.

(e) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments.

(f) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

#### RATE OF EXPENDITURES

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure.

(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appro-

priation acts and other statutes, the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

#### AID TO COMMITTEES

SEC. 7. The heads of departments and establishments shall, at the request of any committee of either House of Congress, furnish such committee with such aid and information with regard to the National Budget as it may request.

#### INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(a) The operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government;

(b) The use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower;

(c) Any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or

(d) The carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

1. Does the bill aim at an economic situation where there will be 60,000,000 jobs?

The bill purposely does not offer any preconceived figure for the total number of jobs needed to provide full employment. The number of jobs needed for full employment depends on such changing factors as total population, the number of young people in the labor force, the size of our post-war armed forces, the extent to which old people retire from the labor market, the number of women who resume their full-time housekeeping duties, the number of hours worked, technological progress, and other considerations. In view of probable changes in these items, the exact number of jobs that would constitute full employment in any one year can best be estimated currently.

2. Does the bill guarantee everyone the kind of job he wants?

This is not a bill to guarantee jobs to any individual. It aims at making real the time-honored right of every American able to work and seeking work to find a job, by giving him the assurance that there are jobs to be had.

3. Does the bill provide for a planned economy?

The bill aims at creating a dynamic approach to the problem of providing expanded production and consumption, thus creating sufficient job opportunities. The approach attempted is not dissimilar to the one taken in the Homestead Act which helped expand our system of free enterprise during the last century.

The kind of Government responsibility envisioned in this bill is excellently described by a quotation from the January 8, 1945, issue of the magazine Time:

"If Government responsibility means stabilization of high business volume by control of the over-all volume of spending and other general measures which do not dictate how men shall earn their livings, it would be a capitalistic blessing."

4. What effect would enactment of the bill have upon the war effort?

By assuring the country that unemployment would not be the aftermath of victory,



the enactment of the bill would mean still greater effort by industry, labor, and agriculture. In particular, it would help avoid the excessive shifts to nonwar work which have taken place after every military victory. Above all, the enactment of the bill unquestionably would contribute to the morale of our fighting men.

5. What would the passage of this bill mean for business and agriculture?

The bill aims at the highest levels of sustained production possible under the free-enterprise system, with the least amount of Government coercion or domination. This is the economic climate most beneficial to business and agriculture.

The bill also aims at eliminating the wild economic fluctuations that have hitherto been so disastrous for the small businessman and the small farmer.

6. Does the bill call for increased expenditures by the Federal Government?

The bill is neither an appropriation measure, nor a revenue measure. It provides a framework within which the administrative and legislative branches of Government working with private enterprise may effectively promote such governmental policies and actions as will bring about maximum activity on the part of private enterprise. This is the only effective way of keeping Federal expenditures to a minimum.

At the present time, nearly half of the total job opportunities are being provided by Government spending for war purposes. As we approach post-war conditions, this proportion will naturally shrink. Consequently, we are entering a period in which Federal expenditures will be declining as expenditures by business and consumers rise, so that the total is maintained at the level necessary to provide full employment.

7. Does the bill provide for "deficit financing?"

The bill provides a positive way for bringing about the greatest possible activity on the part of business. This, in turn, would make it possible to reduce Government expenditures to a minimum. Therefore, except in most dire emergencies, the Government would not have to step into the breach with a spending program.

Furthermore, Government spending does not necessarily mean "deficit financing." It is entirely possible for a Government-expenditure program to be financed through money raised by taxes, rather than through borrowing.

8. What about the national debt?

The enactment of the bill into law, and its sound administration, would have the result of stimulating activity by private enterprise to the maximum. The resultant increase in the production of goods and services would, over a period of time, permit the collection of a comparatively high volume of taxes for debt-retirement purposes, which would be impossible if the national income were to remain at low pre-war levels. The annual service upon the debt, moreover, would represent a relatively small proportion of the national income.

9. How would this bill guard against the danger of inflation or of a speculative boom?

The best guaranty against inflation is a larger volume of production of goods and services. It is precisely the aim of this bill to stimulate the highest possible volume of production by private enterprise. Therefore, this bill provides the best protection imaginable against inflationary tendencies which may occur during the transition from a war economy to a peacetime economy.

In addition the President is required to set forth in the National Budget "a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both" if there

is a prospect of too much spending in comparison with the volume of goods available.

10. Does the bill provide for a new W. P. A.?

It is the very purpose of the bill to assure a continuing high level of activity upon the part of private enterprise and thus to prevent emergency situations in which it might become necessary to resort to a new W. P. A.

On the other hand, should it become necessary to provide additional employment opportunities through Federal public works, the bill provides for the performance of construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws.

11. What is the difference between the National Budget created by this bill and the regular Federal Budget?

The regular Federal Budget deals with the expenditures of the Federal establishments, together with the extent to which these expenditures are to be financed through taxes or borrowing. It does not reveal the relationship between Federal expenditures and those of business, consumers, and State and local governments.

The National Budget, however, deals with the Nation as a whole, not merely the Federal Government. In addition to Federal expenditures, it includes expenditures of business, consumers, and State and local governments. If all expenditures are less than that required to assure full employment, the difference is regarded as a deficit in the National Budget. Such deficit means unemployment and insufficient production. This may be overcome by increasing the aggregate expenditures by business, consumers, and Government until they equal the amount required to assure full employment.

12. In what way does a deficit in the Federal Budget differ from a deficit in the National Budget?

The Federal Budget shows a deficit when expenditures exceed receipts other than from borrowing. In the National Budget, the total of consumer, business, and Government expenditures is always equal to the total of receipts, for the income of business, consumers, and Government comes only from these three sources of expenditures. This balance between the Nation's expenditures and the Nation's receipts may take place at any level—either at \$200,000,000,000 or at \$100,000,000,000. But when the national total of all expenditures or all receipts is less than that required to assure full employment, the difference is regarded as a deficit in the National Budget. This deficit, which shows up as unemployment and underproduction, may be overcome by increasing aggregate expenditures of business, consumers, and Government to equal the amount required to assure full employment.

13. If it is estimated that there are 60,000,000 persons looking for jobs and willing to work, and if it is estimated that private enterprise may provide only 40,000,000 jobs, would the bill call on the Federal Government to provide the deficit of 20,000,000 jobs?

Under the bill the estimates as to the number of persons looking for jobs and the number of jobs available in private business would be made by the President on the basis of available public and private information. Once the estimates are made and a deficiency is found to exist, it is the responsibility of the President to recommend, and of the Congress to adopt, any measures which they believe necessary and desirable for the purpose of aiding and encouraging private enterprise to provide additional job opportunities. Only if the President and the Congress agree that an adequate number of additional job opportunities cannot be created by these various means, is it the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide direct programs for employment.

14. Is the National Budget limited to a single fiscal year?

The question of drawing up a National Budget for 1 fiscal year or longer is left to the judgment of the President. Certain programs of economic development that Congress may want to provide for will present a long-range character that may be planned in 1 year and executed in the course of 2 or 3 years.

Furthermore, individual industries or other groups in the economy may also find it more practical to base their investment plans on projects covering more than 1 year. Therefore, the bill allows the President to present a National Budget for a period longer than 1 fiscal year.

15. Are existing economic statistics adequate for the effective administration of this bill?

A tremendous amount of new information has become available both to private enterprise and to Government as a result of the war effort. The President has asked the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of the Budget and cooperating Government agencies to bring together war and nonwar statistics that will be needed for reconversion to post-war production.

The problem of making advance estimates, however, will not materially affect the administration of the bill, since provision is made for a quarterly review of the National Budget and for whatever changes in the rate of Federal expenditure which may be necessary to meet changing conditions.

16. Why isn't the responsibility of developing the National Budget given to one of the regular Government departments?

The National Budget transcends in scope the activities and responsibility of any one department. While it would be based on the estimates and programs submitted by the various agencies, its development properly belongs in the Executive Office of the President.

17. Is Congress obligated to accept the National Budget transmitted by the President?

No. Like the regular Federal Budget, the National Budget is in the nature of a Presidential recommendation to Congress. Under the provisions of the bill, the Congress would be free to reject in part or in total the President's recommendation and to substitute its own program for full employment.

18. Would the enactment of this bill make other legislation on domestic economic problems unnecessary?

No. The purpose of the bill is to bring into proper focus the wide range of legislative proposals which affect employment and which are likely to be sponsored by the administration or various economic groups—proposals in the field of taxation, social security, export trade, and so forth. Its enactment would give rise to a vastly increased amount of legislative activity.

19. Why is a Joint Committee on the Budget set up?

At present, there is no arm of the Congress that has the responsibility of considering all the elements in the Federal Budget, or the relationships between the Federal Budget and the national economy. With a National Budget in operation, comprehensive congressional consideration of budgetary problems would be still more important than under present circumstances. The Joint Committee on the Budget, therefore, is created to study the National Budget in its entirety.

20. What is the purpose of the joint resolution on the Budget?

At present, individual fiscal measures are handled separately and without any formal consideration of budgetary policy in general. Under the bill, therefore, a joint resolution on the Budget is to be drawn up by the Joint Committee on the Budget and reported to both Houses, where it would then be debated. The resulting resolution would then serve as a general policy framework to guide the operations of the several committees of each

House dealing with fiscal matters. This resolution is to be reported to both Houses by March 1, of each year, so that there would be sufficient time to debate the resolution and enact fiscal policy measures by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

21. What changes does the bill call for in the activities of the various individual congressional committees?

There would be no change in the activities of the individual congressional committees, except that the joint resolution on the Budget would provide a general policy framework within which they would operate.

22. Does the bill provide for lump-sum appropriations to the President?

No. The bill provides for no appropriations at all.

23. How does the philosophy of the bill differ from the "Compensatory economy" philosophy developed during the 1930's?

First of all, it places major emphasis upon non-Federal expenditures and that Federal expenditures are only to be used as a last resort.

Second, it provides for preventing unemployment, rather than for "taking up the slack" after men are walking the street looking for work.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to make an explanation of the bill. I understand the Senate is still in the morning hour, but it seems that speeches are being made, and if speeches are to be made at this time I want the right to make a statement now in support of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough to enable me to make an observation?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for years I have sought to secure the enforcement of the rule which provides that during the morning hour no Senator shall speak longer than 5 minutes. That rule is constantly being violated, and I hope the President of the Senate, without his attention having to be called to it, will enforce that rule. The rule was made for a good purpose, in order that Senators who desire to transact business in the morning hour will not have to wait to listen to long speeches. If any Senator desires to make a speech, he should obtain unanimous consent, but he should not transgress the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I express my complete concurrence in what the majority leader has just stated. I think the rule should be respected. I believe that if the rule is respected, by and large, in the length of time its enforcement will amply justify its existence.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with that rule, and have always followed it. But if I am to be precluded from making a statement in explanation of a very important piece of legislation, I shall ask to have the privilege—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has already obtained unanimous consent to make his explanation. I made the statement which I did simply for the benefit of other Senators, and for future conduct of business.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the history of the world, the struggle for

existence has manifested itself in economic systems that have been constantly changing. At one time western civilization was based upon the feudal manor. Then came the city and the development of handicraft industry. Then came the industrial revolution, and with it the economic system of free enterprise and the political system which we call democracy.

In America private enterprise and political democracy have developed and flourished side by side. They have contributed more to human welfare and human happiness than any previous system. The American people, therefore, want to preserve this system. They want it further strengthened and perfected so as to usher in a still greater future for our country. They know that no economic system can survive by remaining static. Times and conditions change, and our lives must change with them.

Our free-enterprise system has been subject to many improvements. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, we have enacted minimum-wage laws, we have reduced working hours, we have created unemployment compensation benefits, we have provided old-age benefits, we have guaranteed the right of collective bargaining for labor, we have corrected abuses in the security market and provided protection to investors. We have made it possible for millions of farmers to cooperate among themselves and with their Government in matters of land use, soil conservation, production, and prices. When these laws were first proposed they were attacked and it was charged that they would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise throughout the years, we have as yet been unable to control the violent economic fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western frontier, which acted as a safety valve in times of depression. Furthermore, it permitted constant expansion. We aided this expansion through the enactment of the Homestead Act, the Railroad Land Grant Act, and the mineral and mining laws, which threw open the public domain to exploitation and development. As early as 1816 we began to enact tariff laws deliberately designed to protect and foster business rather than for revenue. Through the pension system following the Civil War, we increased the capacity of our population to consume the newly developed riches and thereby, in turn, provided additional incentive for further expansion.

Expansion is the essence of our capitalist system. But today, when there is no longer any frontier in the geographical sense, we must think of strengthening our free competitive economy by expanding it from within. Today our new frontier is in our back yard in every State and city of the country. Today we must again attempt to foster economic expansion through wise laws, just as we

did when we enacted the Homestead Act and the other measures which helped develop the West.

If, after the war, we fail to expand, America will once again be visited with another great depression. And another serious depression would mean millions of disillusioned and jobless men would have little interest in the maintenance of a system which offers so little in the way of good living conditions. It would give birth to strong political pressures against such a system.

There are some in this country who have lost faith in capitalism. It is up to us in the Congress to stop this trend. I have a stubborn and abiding faith in the principle of private competitive enterprise and in the necessity of making our system work. I have confidence that we can succeed in finding a way to eliminate its principal weakness—periodic mass unemployment.

The full employment bill which we are proposing here today is a bill to help make free enterprise work. For unless we make it work, unless we can make it operate so as to avoid the wild fluctuations that have characterized our economy in past years, capitalism will be threatened in America and throughout the world. Already, before the war, three of the largest nations in the world had abandoned it, and many other nations were preparing to emulate their action.

There are some today who dread lest America be converted to socialism, communism, fascism, or some other ism such as those that have taken root in other countries. I say to them—let us make our system of private competitive enterprise work so well here in America that other countries will seek to imitate us. Other nations follow our lead in technology—in mass production methods of making steel and of fabricating automobiles and airplanes. Why should we not progress to the point where they will imitate us in the field of economics also?

Why can we not take the lead in remedying the weaknesses that have developed in our capitalist system? Why can we not set an example here for all the peoples of the world by affording the fullest possible opportunity and encouragement for private initiative and ending chronic unemployment? Why can we not demonstrate to the world that it is possible to have the highest standard of living without abandoning our cherished political freedoms?

My colleagues, who have joined me in sponsoring this bill, the distinguished senior Senators from New York, Utah, and Wyoming, have to their credit some of the most valuable and constructive social and economic legislation on the statute books of the Nation. They have served their country well as chairmen of important committees of the United States Senate, and their broad understanding of economic and social problems is well recognized.

As chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, the senior Senator from Wyoming has made a historic study of the operations of the American economy. In the final report of the Temporary National Economic



Committee in March 1941 he made the following prophetic statement:

The termination of the war effort, putting to an end, as it may very suddenly, the industrial activity now gaining tremendous momentum, will bring with it problems more critical and more fraught with danger than those which followed the collapse of 1929. Unless the democratic society of America shall have prepared in advance for this hour there will be no alternative except Government action, which will necessarily be as inconclusive as the action which has heretofore been taken. The unsolved problems of post-war depression will be heaped upon the unsolved problems of pre-war depression and it is difficult to say how, in these circumstances, democracy can survive unless democracy prepares for peace now.

The distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming concluded his statement by stressing the need of finding "a formula for stimulated production under the impetus of peace rather than war."

My colleagues and I believe that the full-employment bill provides a method of achieving the desired volume of peacetime production within the framework of our democratic political institutions and of our economy of free enterprise.

In the past we have made many attempts to grapple with the problem of unemployment. But we have lacked the essential weapons to deal with this problem effectively. We have never had a consistent and openly arrived at national policy on employment. We have never had a businesslike method of appraising the operations of our economy and our Government. We have never had a real understanding of the economic responsibilities of the President, as Chief of the executive branch, and of the Congress of the United States.

The proposed full-employment bill supplies us the three elements we have lacked in the past.

First. It establishes a national policy on the maintenance of employment opportunities.

Second. It creates a budgetary system to appraise the operations of both the national economy and the Government.

Third. It defines the economic responsibilities of the President and the Congress.

These three elements, when added together, provide the opportunity for full and wholehearted cooperation between industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments and the Federal Government—the cooperation which is essential to our hopes and plans for a stronger and better America.

I shall discuss each of these points briefly.

#### NATIONAL POLICY ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

The bill declares that it is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time home and family responsibilities. The bill recognizes that these Americans are entitled to opportunities for "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

The right to a job does not mean guaranteeing John Jones a given job carrying a set salary and a definite social standing. It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. However, I believe nobody will deny that our economic system of free enterprise must offer opportunities for jobs for all who are able and want to work. Our American system owes no man a living but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living. That is the proper interpretation of the "right to work."

Full employment is not a static condition. It depends upon changing national trends, population growth, changes in school age or retirement age, the number of persons serving in the armed forces, the number of hours worked, and similar factors which change the size of the labor force.

Furthermore, full employment does not mean that there should be at any given time no unemployment at all. Our economic system requires flexibility, which means that at all times a minimum amount of unemployment is unavoidable. Technological advances, the desire to shift to other work, seasonal changes in production, or other circumstances cause what is known among economists as short-run frictional unemployment. As conditions change, the volume of this relatively small amount of frictional unemployment will also change.

The responsibility of the Government with regard to full employment is clearly stated in the bill. I quote from the declaration of policy, as set forth in the bill:

In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure.

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

This policy is in accord with the philosophy recently expressed by an outstanding political leader. I quote:

Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise.

If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

This statement was made in San Francisco on September 21, 1944, by the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In the same speech, Governor Dewey emphasized the responsibility of government, in the following words:

Yet, if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore it is the business of government.

In this connection I should also like to quote from an editorial from a leading American business magazine, pointing out the Government's responsibility on employment so clearly that it has been imprinted upon my mind ever since. The editorial reads:

Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that he does not know how to guarantee, without Government intervention, the markets with which alone his free competitive capitalism can function. Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that, if left to its own devices, business would sooner or later run headlong into another 1930.

This editorial appeared in the June 1938 issue of *Fortune* magazine, and I obtained unanimous consent to have it printed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* during 1938.

#### A BUDGETARY SYSTEM

The bill sets up a national production and employment budget to help appraise the extent to which the total demand for goods and services is sufficient to assure the productive employment of those who are willing and able to work.

This national production and employment budget differs from the ordinary budget of the Federal Government in that it includes not only investment and expenditures by the Federal Government, but also investment and expenditures by all groups in the country: Consumers, business, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. The sum total of all these expenditures adds up to what the economists call the gross national product or the gross national income. This total expenditure for goods and services is the generally accepted measurement of our Nation's total economic activity.

When the aggregate volume of expenditures by consumers, business, State and local governments, and Federal Government is equivalent to the volume needed to guarantee full employment, this national production and employment budget is regarded as balanced. If there is a deficiency of total expenditures, the result will be unemployment.

The purpose of this new budgetary system is to provide a businesslike way of appraising:

(a) The number of jobs needed over a given period to provide full employment;

(b) The total of consumer-business-Government expenditures required to provide that number of jobs;

(c) The prospective volume of investment and other expenditures by consumers, business, and Government, including expenditures in our foreign trade;

(d) The fiscal or other programs required to encourage additional private employment, if necessary; and

(e) Whatever program of Federal investment and expenditure may be required as a last resort to make up the difference between the total required expenditures and the total that is likely to prevail without additional Federal investment and expenditures.

This procedure is not only businesslike and logical, but it is also conducive to drawing upon all segments of our economy for their maximum effort.

## A FRAMEWORK OF RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility of the President under the bill is to report to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, on the extent to which the economy is providing jobs for all. This report might be regarded as an essential part of the state of the Union message. If he finds that there is unemployment or that there is the danger of unemployment, he must transmit his program for assuring full employment through stimulating private enterprise and through necessary Government programs, together with recommendations for such additional legislation as he deems desirable.

Congressional responsibilities are also defined.

At the present moment, unfortunately, there is no single body within either House of the Congress which has the responsibility of considering in a comprehensive manner either:

First. The general contents—with respect to taxes, appropriations, and borrowings—of the regular Federal Budget; or

Second. The relationship between the regular Federal Budget and the national economy.

For example, both Houses of Congress have just received the President's proposed Budget for the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee will study the Budget's proposals for individual agencies. The Finance Committee will study the revenue aspects of the Budget message. But no committee will study the Budget message as a whole, or its relation to our national economy.

The full-employment bill sets up a joint committee to make a detailed study of the national production and employment budget transmitted to Congress by the President. This committee, called the Joint Committee on the Budget, is to be composed of 15 Members of each House, chosen in such a manner as to reflect the relative political strength of the major political parties.

By March 1, at the very latest, this committee would be expected to report to both Houses of Congress a joint resolution setting forth a general policy with respect to the National Budget for the next fiscal year.

Consideration of the joint resolution would mean an annual debate, in both Houses, on national economic policy. The resolution could then be amended in any manner that the majority of Congress might determine to be appropriate. As finally agreed to, it would serve as a general policy framework within which the individual committees of Congress could work on individual appropriation acts, revenue acts, and related measures.

These provisions go a long way toward restoring Congress to its rightful place as the policy-determining branch of the Government. And this is done in a way which provides for active interplay between the Congress and the Executive, a way which makes the two branches of the Government really coordinate. The bill avoids both the danger of delegating excessive power to the Executive, and the danger of involving Congress in administrative determinations.

I should like to point out that the bill aims at eliminating business uncertainty over the Government's fiscal policies. Business cannot plan effectively for full employment without knowing the Government's plans. This requires advance knowledge and open discussion of the Government's plans, and reasonable con-

sistency and stability in the administration of the Government's program.

For example, revenue measures are often enacted only a few weeks before they are to become effective. This, I submit, does not give the businessman sufficient time to consider the Government's tax policy in relation to his own plans for future investment. Under this bill it would be easier for Congress to develop its fiscal policies in a unified manner, and to enact both revenue and appropriation measures before the beginning of each fiscal year.

## TYPES OF NATIONAL BUDGET

The full employment bill recognizes that we live in a world of changing conditions and changing requirements in national economic policy. For that reason, it provides no fixed proportions of the National Budget to be supplied by consumers, business, or Government. In certain circumstances, Congress may find it desirable or necessary to provide:

First. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in consumers' expenditures; or

Second. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in the capital outlays of business; or

Third. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in Government expenditures.

Naturally there could be all degrees of difference between these three general types, as well as combinations of any types.

In other words, the Government's program could aim at balancing the national economy through measures to increase consumers' expenditures, through measures to increase capital outlays of business, through increased Government expenditures, or through a combination of those methods.

There are some who think that the major emphasis in our post-war economy must be upon Government expenditures. There are others who say that this means deficit financing, and that deficit financing would lead to a planned economy or to national bankruptcy. They, in turn, propose that the Government do everything in its power to give a green light to business and heighten the confidence of private investors so that the major emphasis in the post-war period would be upon increased capital outlays of private enterprise.

It is my own personal opinion—and I have stated this before on the floor of the Senate—that the royal road to prosperity is high wages, low prices, and a tax system that is unequivocally based upon the ability to pay and the encouragement to produce. It is my belief that in this way, with only moderate Government expenditures for desirable Government services, we could achieve a more equitable distribution of the national income. It is my conviction that this improved distribution of the national income would give us an unprecedented expansion in consumers' expenditures and a vigorous, though not excessive, expansion in the capital outlays of business.

But my personal opinion on how the national economy might best be balanced is not relevant to the question of how it would be balanced under this bill. The

specific National Budget that would result in any given period would be determined, not by the operations of any one individual or any one group, but on the basis of that active interplay between all groups and all our political leaders which is the very essence of the democratic process in our democratic America.

## NEED FOR ACTION

A few weeks ago, Dr. Gallup's interviewers went around the country asking people whether they thought that there would be enough jobs after the war. Sixty-eight percent thought that there would not be enough jobs. The younger people of the country were even more pessimistic than their elders; 73 percent of those between 20 and 30 years of age thought that the outlook was black.

What Senator would stand up and say that the people of this country are mistaken in their beliefs? Who is there who, on the basis of what has thus far been done in the field of post-war planning, would be willing to predict that there will be jobs for all after this war?

We all know that during the war we have transformed our economy into an economic skyscraper of breath-taking magnitude.

We all know that when war-production contracts are withdrawn, the danger will be that the entire edifice will topple over.

We all know that while the end of the war may bring with it 6 to 18 months of an inflationary boom, the long-term threat is a deflationary collapse.

Unless an economic substitute is found for war contracts, we face mass unemployment in this country of a magnitude which could easily surpass anything that was dreamed of during the last depression. Thus far, we have not found that substitute.

This country cannot afford again to go into a depression such as we experienced in the 1930's. It would be extremely dangerous to do so. Mass unemployment would mean discontent, disunity, and an irreparable loss to our Nation in terms of both physical wealth and moral well-being.

Still more appalling, an unemployment crisis in America would spread like wildfire throughout the world. It would give us dumping, higher tariffs, export subsidies, blocked currencies, and every other new and old type of economic warfare. And this, I submit, would inevitably wreck our plans for an effective international security organization, turn back the clock of progress, and plunge us into another holocaust of blood, suffering, and chaos.

We here in Congress have it in our power to take effective action now to reassure the people of America that mass unemployment shall not happen again.

We have it in our power to make full employment the cardinal principle in our domestic economic policy.

We have it in our power to make full employment in America the keystone of our economic relations with the other countries of the world.

## BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

In principle, both of our major political parties are agreed that this must be provided.



In Chicago, on October 28, 1944, President Roosevelt stated that "every American, able to work and willing to work, has the right to a useful and remunerative job." To make this right effective he promised America 60,000,000 post-war jobs.

In Seattle, on September 18, 1944, Governor Dewey, the Republican nominee for President, made the following statement:

We must have full employment. \* \* \* Those who come home from the war and those who have produced for war—all our people—have earned a future with jobs for all.

The full-employment bill, I submit, provides the instrument whereby the political parties can make good on their common aspirations for post-war full employment.

#### NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE DEBATE

Of course, some Members of Congress may disagree with the sponsors of this bill. That is how it should be in a democracy. Sound legislation can be developed only by clarifying the differences between conflicting schools of thought. The sponsors of this bill, therefore, welcome criticism. We welcome debate on alternative methods of assuring post-war full employment.

But let it be constructive debate. Let it not be like the writings of some editorialists and columnists who, in their pontifical infallibility, have thrown up their hands in horror at the full-employment bill—and have then offered no constructive proposals of their own.

The United States Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On this issue of full employment, at a time when democratic institutions are under attack in one country after another, the opportunity exists for the Members of the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress to demonstrate that we really are the greatest deliberative body in the world, and that we have the capacity to bring forth constructive legislation fully commensurate with the needs of our country.

I have faith in the Members of this body. I know that they will take advantage of this opportunity. I know that if any Senators arise to take issue with the principles set forth in the full-employment bill, they will realize that, as Members of this great deliberative body, and as influential leaders of public opinion, they are under obligation to offer alternative proposals of their own. If such proposals indicate the need for changes which are practical and realistic, they will undoubtedly win the support of this body.

Every two decades, for the past 100 years, we have been plagued by a boom and a major depression; and every decade has brought forth new explanations as to the causes of the business cycle and new remedies. But there is one fact upon which all are agreed, namely, that fear of a depression tends to lead us inevitably into a depression. When business, agriculture and labor fear unemployment, they make plans to adjust themselves to unemployment. When their daily actions are based upon such

plans, then we are doomed to have unemployment.

Whatever program we adopt, therefore, let us act without delay.

Let us have courage and be decisive in our efforts. Let us not be swayed by fear of our inability to determine our own destiny.

Let us not wait until millions of men are walking the streets looking for work before we do something about post-war employment.

Let us act now, through the regular legislative processes as set forth in our Constitution, to provide our businessmen, our farmers, and workers, and, above all, our 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors, with confidence in the future of American enterprise and American democracy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the bill which the Senator introduces substantially the same as that which was printed in the New York Times 2 or 3 weeks ago?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it has been greatly improved as the result of constant study and contact with the experts of the Treasury Department and experts of the Federal Reserve Board and of various other Federal agencies.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend that the bill shall be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I shall ask that it go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I might say that if the bill is as I have understood it to be described its philosophy is so completely at variance with my whole idea of the American system that I made a brief address analyzing the bill on Thursday night, which was inserted by me in the RECORD today, and I hope that those who read the speech made by the Senator from Montana today will do me the favor of reading the speech which I made on the bill. I think we have here a fundamental difference. I agree fully with the Senator from Montana on the importance of the subject, but I believe very strongly that the remedy which he has suggested is absolutely dangerous and incorrect.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Montana if he has suggested that the bill which he has just introduced be referred also to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning?

Mr. MURRAY. It is my intention, and I am now in the process of preparing a copy of the bill, with an explanation of it, and will ask consent to have it sent to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that that committee has

no power to report the bill. It could be referred to that committee for the information of the committee, of course, but not for the purpose of having a report submitted.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that I am very happy the Senator has done that. As I understood him, he asked that the bill be referred to the legislative Committee on Banking and Currency. In view of the fact, however, that this measure deals with a fundamental policy of greatest importance, and in view of the further fact that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is the head has been set up by the Senate to study post-war economic policy and planning, it is of the utmost importance, I think, that that committee should participate in the study. The co-operative action of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee with the legislative committee on matters of such far-reaching importance could not fail to be beneficial to all concerned. The Senator from Montana has, on numerous occasions, consulted me—and I feel grateful to him for so doing—with respect to the underlying plan of this bill. I feel that the study which can be given to it by these two committees cannot fail to be helpful.

#### UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER IN GOVERNMENT PLANTS—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from time to time the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and later the war program has made reports to the Senate, and particularly on occasions when it was apparent that some major problem was holding up the war effort. It will be recalled that the committee reported to this body on the necessity for complete conversion to the war program. We reported on the matter of the recruitment and training of personnel for the war effort. We reported to the Senate on the question of eliminating bottlenecks and material shortages. Now I wish to discuss with my colleagues of the Senate the apparent need today of the proper utilization of manpower in Government plants, the navy yards, and arsenals.

Our committee is making an investigation, as quickly and as widely as our personnel will permit, and today I wish to discuss particularly what the committee saw at a nearby navy yard.

It is my duty, Mr. President, to reveal to the Senate what I believe to be an alarming condition. A subcommittee of the war investigating committee last week visited the Norfolk Navy Yard. I might say we visited several other navy yards as well, and reports on them will be forthcoming shortly. What we learned in Norfolk is, I believe, disturbing and, I think, most significant.

The armed forces have long painted a gloomy picture of their civilian labor needs. Program after program on the "must" list is described as short of labor,

One such "must" is the ship-repair program. Norfolk Navy Yard, which both builds and repairs ships, employs over 38,000 people. It is said to be short more than 4,000 workers for essential programs. But in this yard the subcommittee found excess manpower, wasted labor, hoarded labor, and enforced loafing. We did not investigate the entire yard, but we checked several large shops employing thousands of people. We also went through several ships. Here is what we found: Each of the members of our subcommittee personally saw idleness and loafing on a big scale. Men stood and sat around in groups smoking and talking right on the decks of vital fighting ships. Their bosses were not to be seen. The men themselves think there are too many of them on the job. They say they are unable to do an honest day's work. They brought these complaints to us and brought them before our committee after they were sworn.

So many men are assigned to some jobs that they cannot even all squeeze into the place. Most of them stand around outside while a few work.

Men waste valuable time and materials making personal trinkets for their superiors. One man deferred as an essential worker spends most of his time on such work. Valuable hand-carved furniture is made in wartime for the use of the shop masters. Many weeks of labor were wasted on one table alone, which our committee saw. While we were in the yard, work was being done on an ornate checkerboard and on a special table for opening oysters.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think it would be wise to permit the Members of the Senate to see the checkerboard and the table to which the Senator has referred, which I believe are available. The checkerboard was just one of many we traced down which were made by this one man, who is under 30, with no children, and who apparently devoted all his time for a while to making cigarette boxes from lucite, as well as hand-carved legs of tables for the masters' conference room. I wonder if the Senator would care to have that checkerboard brought into the Senate, to show the volume of work done on it, if being inlaid. Incidentally, it is made from Government material.

Mr. MEAD. I understand the checkerboard is available, and it will be called to the attention of the Senate a little later in the progress of this statement.

Mr. KILGORE. If the Senator will yield again, one other matter which impressed me was the fact that before going to Norfolk I had read in the newspapers of the coal shortage. My State being a coal-producing State, I made a tour of the employment offices in the State, in each of which I found a recruiter from the Norfolk Navy Yard taking experienced miners away from the mines and giving them priorities to go to the Norfolk Navy Yard. Of course, there were many other recruiters there. There were recruiters from Bethlehem

Steel, Sparrows Point. They seemed to divide up, Bethlehem Steel, one also from Bethlehem-Fairfield, Hercules Powder, and Goodyear Rubber, recruiting workers from the mines, at a time when the mines in my State are only 75-percent manned, and the newspapers claim there is a fuel shortage. That was a matter which impressed me in connection with the question, why 4,000 additional men are needed for that yard. I think it is well that the Senate should know why that yard needs 4,000 additional men, taken largely from the coal mines of Virginia and West Virginia.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am pleased with the interjection, and I wish to say to Senators that the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, as they already know, is a diligent and hard-working member of our committee. He himself made a survey of the situation at the Norfolk Navy Yard, and I am sure we can agree with him that the recruitment of labor in the district of which he speaks for this particular operation is not in keeping with the over-all and appropriate plan of manpower mobilization.

Mr. KILGORE. I may interject that these recruiters, when they secure a man's consent to go to Norfolk Navy Yard, have automatically forced his release from the mine in which he is working by an enforced release.

Mr. MEAD. That is because they have a higher priority rating.

Mr. KILGORE. It is because they have a higher priority on manpower.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the oyster table I spoke of was intended for use for one oyster feast that was to be attended by the shop masters.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator how many shop masters there are.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that there is one master mechanic to every shop, and there is a small number of shops.

Mr. KILGORE. Not over 25?

Mr. MEAD. Not over 25.

Mr. KILGORE. So it was not a general morale idea for the whole yard but simply for 25 or 26 men?

Mr. MEAD. Only for the masters.

Erection of an elaborate Christmas tree and a model village with elaborate lighting took many days' work. All this work was directed to be done by supervisors.

Men are told to stretch out jobs and to appear to be working.

When investigators go through the men are warned in advance to look busy. They must put work into machines even if they merely ruin metals. A few minutes before the investigators actually appear, another warning is given by a "Paul Revere" who tears through the shop just ahead of the investigators.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were the supervisors civilians or naval officers?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts asked that question. The supervisors are for the most part civil-service workers. There are, however, officers of the Navy in charge of

these shops, but the immediate supervision, I would say, is by civil-service employees.

Mr. WALSH. So that in order to dismiss or discharge any supervisor who was found not to be performing his duty efficiently, charges would have to be preferred against him and evidence presented?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me so that I may make answer to that question?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. The apparent situation, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts is that naval officers come and naval officers go, but the master mechanics and the supervisors remain forever, and I think the Senator from New York will remember that we could not find a single job order actually signed by a naval officer. All of them were signed by the master mechanics. I do not know whether they can sign an order for building a battleship, but they can certainly sign orders for anything smaller than that apparently, and they stay on the job while the officers are being constantly transferred back and forth.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the navy yards operate somewhat differently from the Army arsenals; that in the navy yards the master mechanics or the foremen are, as in private industry, responsible for the job and for the work; that the Navy officers are simply inspectors and have nothing to do with respect to the men, but see that the work is done, that the material complies with specifications, and that the job is satisfactorily completed. I have had complaints made to me by the master mechanics or by the foremen at the arsenal at Springfield, Mass., that the Army officers interfere with the master mechanics, by saying, "You are not doing this right" or "You ought to do it differently." Protests have been lodged with some Members of the House and with me against that system prevailing in Army arsenals. The statement is made that a foreman and a superintendent ought to be allowed to do the job, and that a transient Army officer or Navy officer who comes and goes every 2 or 3 years, should not tell the foremen and the superintendent how to perform their work.

As I understand the situation at Norfolk, the whole operation is under foremen or master mechanics who are under civil service, and the naval officers are supervisors only to the extent of seeing that the job is done; they do not interfere with the men, or say that a certain man is doing his job satisfactorily or is not doing it satisfactorily, or does not attend to his employment, and should be dismissed. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MEAD. I think as a whole that statement is correct; and, further than that, the selection of men for promotion is originated in the civilian supervisory set-up.



Mr. WALSH. Which is also under civil service.

Mr. MEAD. Which is also under civil service. There is an over-all supervision by naval officers, but as pointed out by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], it is not so direct and so constant as is the supervision of the civil-service employees.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. On that point I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that this is the weakness: The commissioned officers are actually responsible and accountable fiscally and otherwise for everything that goes on, but the actual control is vested in individuals who have no financial responsibility to the Government. In other words, the responsibility and accountability do not go with the actual bosses, but go with the commissioned personnel, who are rather isolated, and if anything goes wrong the naval officers will be blamed. The master goes scot free because of regulations which prescribe that only a commissioned officer can be responsible to the Government for money and material expended on the job.

Mr. MEAD. There is an apparent need for a revision or refinement of this supervisory system so that the Navy Department, through its regular selected and appointed officers, may have a larger share in the actual operation of the plant.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. May I inquire if the committee fixed the blame for this system, which I understood the Senator to say was—

Mr. MEAD. This dual supervisory system?

Mr. WALSH. No; of word being passed around that an inspector is coming, and for the men to get on the job? I think the Senator characterized someone as a "Paul Revere" who went around through the factory.

Mr. MEAD. That is the sworn testimony of a number of employees who appeared before our committee, and we heard about it in other instances. The instance referred to is simply one.

Mr. WALSH. On whom did the committee fix the blame for it?

Mr. MEAD. On the supervisors.

Mr. WALSH. Did the committee find the names of the men or officers so that the Navy Department or some authority could present charges against them? Or did the committee find involved naval officers who ought to be removed for being negligent in the performance of their duty?

Mr. MEAD. We have not presented a finished report. This is simply a statement made to the Senate concerning what we found on this particular visit. Our committee is continuing the investigation, and we may proceed to the point where we may find disciplinary action should be taken. We have not arrived at that point as yet.

XCI—25

Mr. WALSH. I hope the committee will make recommendations, and I hope the committee will name naval officers or civilians who are responsible, and that such naval officers will be court-martialed, and that civilians who are found negligent will be dismissed from the service. The committee can render splendid service by helping the Navy Department to detect this underground system of wasting time and wasting property and not properly performing work. Of course, the system should be traced up as high as it can be traced, in order to find out where the blame is higher up.

Mr. MEAD. I have already said that we have had the cooperation of labor, and we expect the cooperation of management and of the Navy Department, and we have reason to believe we will have such cooperation, because in its own report made on this particular navy yard its recommendations, in some measure at least, square with ours. The Department indicates in its report that there is wasted labor and hoarded labor there, and that there should be better utilization of labor.

Mr. WALSH. That is a report made a year ago when the Navy Department called in some civilian outsiders to make an investigation?

Mr. MEAD. No; there is a later report, made by an industrial set-up which has been created in the Navy for this very purpose. I think Admiral Fisher is in charge.

Mr. WALSH. They are not naval officers, but are supposed to be efficient leaders of industry?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. They are industrial engineers.

Mr. WALSH. While I am on my feet, I should like to make another suggestion. The subject of employees at our navy yards is very important, and the situation is very serious, as the Senator probably ascertained. Is it not a fact that at the navy yard at Norfolk, where there were 40,000 employees, 20,000 of them were assigned by the Labor Board or the Civil Service Commission as new employees during the past year?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And 26,000 employees were dropped from the service, leaving a net loss of 6,000.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the turn-over very extensive, not only at that navy yard, but at all other navy yards?

Mr. MEAD. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator's committee expect to link up that fact with the need for some manpower legislation?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I believe that a good deal of the trouble resulted from relaxation due to predictions that the war would soon be over, and also because of War Production Board orders which launched a great many new civilian programs. The turn-over which occurred, not only in navy yards but at other plants throughout the country, resulted from those orders. There was an attempt on the part of the individual worker to find

peacetime occupation which would be more permanent. However, that trend has been stopped. Only this morning I was informed that since the work-or-fight order was issued, more than 2,000 persons have applied for work at the gate of the Norfolk Navy Yard.

Mr. WALSH. Were any of the supervisors or superintendents informed of these things?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. What defense did they make?

Mr. MEAD. A very inadequate defense. We went as high as the master.

Mr. WALSH. He is a civilian, is he not?

Mr. MEAD. He is a civilian.

Mr. WALSH. Did it appear to the Senator that there was an implied league for loafing or inefficiency, which extended from the masters down, or from labor up to the masters?

Mr. MEAD. No. For the most part, the higher we went among the supervisory personnel, the more they tried to cover up the situation, and to indicate that it was not true, that we actually did not see it. But the further down we went along the line, the more willing the workers were to agree that it was there.

Mr. WALSH. Was the investigating all done by members of the Senator's committee, or was some of it done by members of the committee staff or other personnel?

Mr. MEAD. We had an expert from the War Manpower Commission make a survey, and then our committee went down there with several agents. While we were there, we divided into subcommittees and went in all directions, so that we would not be going in a single direction, with opportunity for everyone to know of our coming before we got there.

Mr. WALSH. Before I take my seat, let me say, that as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I welcome the activities of the Senator's committee along the lines which he has described. I wish to cooperate in every way and to do everything possible to see that inefficiency or violation of the regulations of the Navy is stopped. If any new regulations should be put into force, I wish to assure the Senator of my hearty cooperation. I believe that it is a wise thing on the part of the Congress to have such an investigation, conducted by an independent committee, and not by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on Commerce, so that there can be no suspicion or suggestion that members of the committee might be influenced or prejudiced with respect to one particular department.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the Senator's offer of cooperation. I know that it will be forthcoming willingly, and that it will be very constructive. I assure my distinguished colleague that our work will be brought to his attention, so that it may be helpful to his committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In connection with the question of management, did we not

also learn from the testimony that the Bureau of Ships had control of one line of work, and the Bureau of Yards and Docks had control over another line of work, and that the line of demarcation between them was not clear?

Mr. MEAD. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. When we follow the chain of authority through to the management, we find areas in which the authority of one bureau or the other is not clear.

I greatly appreciate the interest of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in this matter. I believe that this investigation is very vital in connection with the manpower question.

Mr. WALSH. Complaints of a somewhat similar nature have reached me from other navy yards, and also from arsenals. I am disturbed over the fact that there seems to be a lack of that spirit which we expect in time of war from the personnel employed in these great and important agencies of the Government. I do not believe that the situation which has been described is general. I should dislike to think that American workingmen would knowingly participate in any program or effort to loaf on the job. However, if such a condition exists, we should find it out and correct it.

Mr. MEAD. Let me say for the record that, so far as employees in the Norfolk Navy Yard were concerned, when they were assured that they were afforded protection, they very willingly came before our committee and pleaded with us for a more orderly system whereby they could do a real day's work. We have the cooperation of labor, and I am sure we shall have the cooperation of the high naval officials.

Mr. President, as I have previously stated, men were told to stretch out jobs, and appear to be working. Our committee did not receive the customary treatment provided by the "Paul Reverses" on this trip, because we appeared on short notice.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The statement which the Senator has just made is very important. If men were told to stretch out their jobs, who was responsible for such instructions? Let us get our hands on him. If such a situation exists, those responsible for it are indirectly committing sabotage. If anyone is saying "Let us make this job last," we ought to ascertain his name. I hope the committee will do so.

Mr. MEAD. We have the names. They are in the record, in the sworn testimony of witnesses who were told to stretch out the job. This condition exists at a navy yard which has been asking for 4,400 additional workers. The Navy's record was made available to our committee, and this information is taken from the record. There was a report by the Navy's own industrial Survey Board, which operates from the Office of the Secretary of the Navy. From this report the Navy has found that there was poor utilization in the yard. The report concluded that the yard's work could be done with substantially fewer employees, at a time when it was asking for 4,400

additional men. This report was filed with the Department last December. Despite this report, already this month the yard has recruited 2,000 new workers who flocked to its gates in voluntary response to the present recruiting drive.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it contemplated that the Senator from New York and his committee will investigate other navy yards?

Mr. MEAD. We have visited two, and we now have an investigation in progress on another one. We are not neglecting any of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The reason I ask that question is that as Governor of South Carolina various complaints came to me along the same line as those which the Senator has reported. It was stated that thousands of employees reported daily for work, and did nothing all day long. The employees themselves came to see me, and wanted to know what could be done. They wanted to help their Government in time of war, instead of being on the job without rendering service to their Nation.

Mr. MEAD. That is the very story which we received at Norfolk. The men want to work.

Mr. President, we have no reason to believe that the persons in charge of the Norfolk Navy Yard are any less able than those in charge of other navy yards or war plants. In fact, we are informed that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, in comparison with that of some other navy yards, is considered excellent. That yard has built and repaired many great ships.

Mr. WALSH. Their record in the production line is excellent.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. They have built and repaired many great ships, but they are wasting labor.

As I previously stated, to a large degree the supervision is that of the civil service, with the complicated naval organization on top of that. In that connection, the contribution made by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was a good one, because, as it was explained to us, there are several bureaus in Washington, each of which has a part in the operations of the navy yards in the field.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator mentioned the question of civil service. Is it not a fact that we found that one of the things which ought to be cleared up is that the rating and the amount of pay are determined by the number of employees under a given manager? Even according to the report from the Navy Department itself, that condition causes "feather bedding" and the keeping of men on the pay roll, because if they are dismissed, the number under the supervision of a given manager or supervisor will be smaller, and therefore he will receive less pay.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did we not find that to be a fact there?

Mr. MEAD. That was testified to, and it was apparent; because where there are a certain number of men there will be a certain number of supervisors. The supervisors begin with the snapperman. He is the lowest in rank in the supervisor group. Above him is the leaderman. Above him is the quartermaster, and above him is the superquartermaster. Above him is the master man. When the number of employees decrease, both the number and the rate of pay of the personnel diminish.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That is true of all the navy yards; is it not?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, the situation arises more as a result of the general system than because of any particular mismanagement at the Norfolk Navy Yard; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. I wish to make that plain. The condition arises because of the system which is generally followed.

Mr. President, the committee has received information which leads it to believe that manpower is being inefficiently utilized in a great many war plants. That is natural, but it must be stopped. It is natural because prior to the war these plants were efficiently operated. The plants were sufficiently large, and they had the correct number of employees, and the employees were well trained. Then the emergency caused a rapid increase of personnel and machinery, and the recruitment of personnel became more and more difficult as we began to absorb the labor load in its entirety. As a result, many plants are overmanned. It is claimed that they are overmanned simply because they are not able to obtain the trained workers they used to get and because they have training programs and because they have to meet selective-service demands. Therefore, this is the time, all over the country, when a labor utilization program must be instituted.

In that connection, let me say that the War Manpower Commission is not allowed in certain plants. It is feared that it will provoke strikes or that it will create a chaotic condition. But in my opinion, the War Manpower Commission should have the power to go into any plant which has a war contract or into any Government plant and conduct a war-utilization survey.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in connection with the statement of the Senator concerning the increase of personnel, let me say that the Norfolk Navy Yard had 5,000 employees some years ago, but today it has 40,000 employees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator that the system calls for great numbers of workers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me repeat that, probably before the Senator entered the Chamber, I said that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, by comparison, is considered excellent.

Mr. BYRD. But there is no doubt that the system does utilize a great deal of manpower.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.



Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the question of the ability of the War Manpower Commission to go into various shipbuilding plants and to study their programs, has it not been true until very recently that the War Manpower Commission has not been allowed to make a survey?

Mr. MEAD. That is my information.

Mr. FERGUSON. Now that situation has been changed?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the War Manpower Commission must obtain the consent of the particular management concerned.

Mr. MEAD. That is our information.

Mr. President, at one other navy yard at which we made a preliminary visit, we were informed that only 30 percent of the potential work of much of the common labor is actually realized under present conditions, and that in many instances the production of skilled workers is not very much better. When we asked about that we were told that it is due to the fact that we are now reaching—

Mr. WALSH. The bottom of the barrel.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct; that is a very good statement of the situation now existing, namely, we are reaching the bottom of the labor barrel. We were informed that we not only need recruitment programs and training programs, but, above all, we need a scientific, expert survey of the situation by the War Manpower Commission. It must be given added authority in order to do a good job.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sorry I entered the Chamber after the Senator began his remarks, and that I failed to hear a considerable part of his statement; but I assume he has been talking about the situation existing in the various navy yards.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator been discussing the general situation in regard to the supply of manpower, its potentialities, and its reserves?

Mr. MEAD. No; I was discussing the situation at the Norfolk navy yard; and I have said that, by comparison, based on Navy figures, that yard's record is considered excellent.

We are making a survey of other navy yards, let me say to my distinguished colleague, but we are not as yet ready to discuss them.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. We intend to continue our investigation in other plants until this situation is corrected.

In this work we have utilized, and will continue to utilize, the services of an expert made available to us by the War Manpower Commission. This expert has been invaluable to our committee.

As I have said before, we have enjoyed the cooperation of labor. We expect the same cooperation from management.

We have arrived at a stage in our war-production picture where manpower utilization must be the prime objective.

As the war has progressed we have encountered many obstacles. In every period of our production effort we have had to concentrate primarily on one of these obstacles, although continuing to work strenuously on the others. Our first problems concerned the acquisition of raw materials, the construction of plants, the conversion of peacetime industry into a wartime economy, and the building of new machines and tools. But now our first problem is the utilization of labor.

Throughout the last 4 years we have continuously striven to find manpower for the armed forces without disrupting the production of munitions and other essential articles. During this time much thought and effort have been devoted to the problems of manpower utilization. But today we have come to the point where the most urgent and largest task which remains to be done is properly to mobilize the human forces, the manpower resources of this Nation for the waging of all-out war. The key to this problem lies in the efficient utilization of the abilities of each individual.

Mr. President, we have gone far and have accomplished much in the prosecution of this war. We have the best trained Army this country has ever known. We have accomplished a miracle of production. We produce 100,000 planes and 20,000,000 tons of shipping a year. In order to exceed these goals and to go on to even greater records we must improve the efficiency of our labor force.

The armed forces have asked for a National Service Act. This, we understand, is a direct result of increased manpower needs developed in the last few months. The Army says it needs more soldiers. To equip them, and to keep pace with the furious tempo of the war, more production is required, and for it more workers.

Less than 2 months ago, the picture, though grim, was more promising. General Somervell, Mr. Hay, and Mr. Krug testified before our committee last December that they expected to pull through without asking for any new laws. At that time about 40 percent of war programs were behind schedule. Manpower shortages were responsible for 22 percent of the trouble, according to Mr. Krug.

Much has been accomplished since then. Labor recruitment for all "must" programs proceeded satisfactorily until the holiday season, when, as must have been expected, it slumped badly. Throughout January, voluntary labor recruitment has been excellent.

Mr. President, one of the officers at the Norfolk Navy Yard told us that they now have very little difficulty in recruiting at the gate. More than 2,000 persons have applied for work there in recent weeks. That is the first time that has happened in a long period of time.

The American people have shown their willingness to respond voluntarily whenever the facts have been made clear to them, and we expect to help make them clear. Our committee has frequently pointed out the need to give the people the facts. Too often the people have been scolded for acting on optimistic

news put out by military or other Government authorities. If the military situation requires a greater effort on the part of those at home, they will respond; but they should be told the facts.

Just a few months ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain and General Eisenhower were telling us that the war would soon be over or that we could expect that it would soon be over. We all shared in the resultant feeling of buoyancy. Naturally, some persons relaxed their efforts under those circumstances.

Now some persons are confused. The news columns of the press print rosy reports, but the very same newspapers recently have carried statements that they are not being allowed to print the real facts. Give the people the facts, tell them clearly what to do, and they will do it.

Recent newspaper reports state that 243 nurses were enlisted in New York City alone within a few days after the call for more nurses went out, and that over 4,000 of the 20,000 who are required volunteered in the first week.

Employment officials state that today they are being flooded with applicants. In part, this is due to the pressure which is being brought to bear on IV-F's, and in part it is due to a realization on the part of the people that we are in a real fight, perhaps just getting into the real battle.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I am really very much surprised to hear the statement which the Senator has just made. I do not doubt that the Senator has been informed employment offices are being flooded with requests for employment. I cannot take up a newspaper without reading in it requests by various industries in my State for more employees. I know that in one small manufacturing town, having a few industries, every night an advertisement appears in the newspaper, covering from an eighth to a quarter of a page, appealing for employees in every one of the small industries in that town. All the Boston newspapers contain similar requests. I am surprised to hear the statement that employment offices are crowded with applicants for employment.

Mr. MEAD. That is the report which we have received from some of the employment offices which we contacted, as well as from the War Manpower Commission. A statement was made to us by the officer in charge of production at the Norfolk Navy Yard to the effect that 2,000 applicants had been recruited for work in the past 2 weeks since the call went out.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that at the Norfolk Navy Yard during the month of January there was a complete reversal of the former experience there with respect to obtaining employees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. The naval officer said that for some unexpected reason there had been an increase in the number of applicants for employment as compared with the past year.

Mr. MEAD. We are beginning to understand that that situation is now fairly general in the various war plants.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I may state that in Boston and other New England areas during the evening hours from 6 o'clock to midnight every radio program is interrupted four or five times by a radio announcer calling for help in behalf of various industries.

Mr. MEAD. I have in my possession a number of letters which I think will be illuminating on that subject.

It may be that we need some form of legislation to keep war workers on their jobs. It seems most unlikely that this would take the form of an all-over regimentation of 100,000,000 Americans. This task may prove so complicated and so cumbersome that it could only add to our troubles.

The inefficiencies which mark the administration of the few existing regulations would multiply and thrive in a completely regimented system. No existing agency could do the job. Certainly the armed forces have failed to demonstrate sufficient capacity to deal with such non-military matters. Full national service at this stage of the war, with the present inefficiencies in utilization, would result only in chaos, because if the employers already have more workers than are needed, and they are given additional workers there will be an additional utilization job on their hands.

There may be a need for specific types of legislation to accomplish specific results. Such measures might include provisions to keep IV-F's in war work, to eliminate turn-over by freezing at least some workers in their jobs, and to prevent people from loafing or taking jobs in nonessential industry at times when, and in places where, there are jobs open in war industries. Such legislation with real teeth may well be needed.

But before we can intelligently vote for or against any such legislation, we must have more facts. We must know the real military situation. We must be told the full production situation. We must know what has been done to make war production more effective. We must know exactly how such legislation would be enforced.

From the information which our committee has been able to gather so far, one thing is clearly apparent. If we need further manpower controls, we certainly need additional production controls.

The manpower which is forced to work in our plants must be used efficiently. Labor and industry must take more effective steps to do this. Government must insist on this result, and Government must help to achieve it.

A manpower draft of any kind means hardship, and impairment of the civilian economy upon which the prosecution of the war and the future of our Nation depend. These sacrifices which would be involved—and they may not be small sacrifices—must be made if they are needed. No matter how great they are, they are

nothing when compared to the sacrifices of the men who are shedding their blood for us. Any sacrifice here at home is worth while if there is even a chance of its helping to shorten the war. But the result would be worse than useless if, instead of doing good, such inroads into the home economy should result in a net loss.

There are still some instances of labor and management being reluctant to give us practices which interfere with efficient production. Production delays, resulting from hard and fast boundaries between crafts, are still a major cause of delay. Carpenters have to wait for electricians. Electricians have to wait for toolmakers, and so on, with the result that each craft spends a substantial amount of its time waiting to get to work. In the meantime, the Nation must wait for war production. Management also, in a great many instances, has shown a reluctance to reengineer jobs, to increase efficiency, and to make changes which would increase production.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What does the Senator mean by a re-engineering job?

Mr. MEAD. A re-engineering job would mean that in the light of new demands and new practices the work could be arranged so as to be done more efficiently.

Mr. President, a plant manager will not rack his brains to put in an efficient system if he can merely call for and obtain additional workers whenever he wants them.

The workers, some of whom have a tendency to loaf on the job as it is, will be much more likely to do so if they are working under compulsion.

In other words, the existing condition will not be eliminated. It will become worse. We want to diminish the demand for labor by proper utilization. That, in my judgment, will be done only with the approval and support of labor itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that because of voluntary retirement and dismissals, a very considerable turn-over takes place, which results in a deficiency?

Mr. MEAD. What the Senator has said is true to some extent with respect to dismissals, and is also true to some extent with respect to retirement, but I should not say that the turn-over due to those causes is large.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator know what the rate of turn-over has been?

Mr. MEAD. It has been large as applied to the IV-F's.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. It is said that the situation has been stabilized to a considerable extent. When the Nation was given to understand that we were well on our way to victory and we felt that it would not be long before workers could return to civilian occupations, there was a great

turn-over of employment. The turn-over took place because men felt that they could provide better for their future by securing a position in a permanent industry.

Mr. BREWSTER. So the Senator feels that the more critical phase of the war which has recently taken place has helped to improve the situation?

Mr. MEAD. It has.

Mr. BREWSTER. When the situation with respect to the war improves—as we certainly hope it will—will there not be a tendency for the difficulty to recur unless we provide for some form of stabilizing employment?

Mr. MEAD. I trust that it will not recur.

Mr. BREWSTER. If a man is not required to remain in a war job, why should he remain in it and sacrifice his future after the return of peace?

Mr. MEAD. Some control can be exercised by the W. P. B. in authorizing civilian activities to increase, as was done a year ago.

Mr. BREWSTER. Those controls proved utterly inadequate through 4 pessimistic months last summer, as the Senator well recalls.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there not a very great likelihood that that situation will recur when the war situation improves, as we hope it will within the next few months?

Mr. MEAD. There is such a possibility; and we should guard against it as a result of the experiences of the past. I think the idea is a very excellent one to be put into the Record.

Mr. President, we have learned through sad experience that placing more men in a plant will not necessarily mean more production.

Surveys conducted by the War Manpower Commission show that idle labor can be eliminated in war plants. This is accomplished by vigorous action. When successful it usually results in a corresponding increase in production. This has been done in many cases.

In one shipyard alone which this committee has investigated, total employment was reduced about 10,000 in the last year, while the yard's productivity remained equal to what it had been with the swollen labor force. This was a result of a desire on the part of the management and the Maritime Commission to improve performance. Without incentives to do the job efficiently, management must be expected to try to accomplish its ends by using excess labor.

The war contract set-up has not helped this situation. The cost-plus contract not only provided no incentive to keep pay rolls down but actually paid dividends for hoarding labor, because if the contract were terminated before completion, the amount of fee paid depended on the proportion of the job which was finished. Any work completed as a result of hiring excess labor benefited the contractor. The cost was all the Government's.

When we adopted the system of fixed-price contracts, we accomplished little to correct this situation. In the first place, the prices were based on cost experience acquired under the cost-plus-fixed-fee



system. As a result, the price allows the accumulation of excess labor. Secondly, there is no incentive to cut costs by reducing the amount of labor, because profits realized in that way would be absorbed by renegotiation or taxes.

The last year has seen substantially increased efficiency in war plants. The Manpower Commission surveyed one shipbuilding company, which in August of 1944 said it needed 17,000 additional workers. When the job was finished in October, the needs had been reduced to 1,000. At the same time production jumped from five and seven-tenths to seven ships a month.

But the Manpower Commission has not really been permitted to do a job. It lacks the power to go into many plants. In the shipbuilding industry it is permitted to make its surveys only if the plant management agrees. Too often management says that a survey would disrupt production.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is that true about the navy yards and arsenals?

Mr. MEAD. No; I cannot say it is. I think as a rule the navy yards cooperate very well.

Mr. WALSH. Why has not the War Manpower Commission made some recommendation with regard to these matters?

Mr. MEAD. I believe, in justice to them, I should say that they have mentioned this to our committee. Until November they were all pretty sure that they were up to schedule, but in December the scheduling was so impoverished and the supply of workers so reduced by demands which were not foreseen that immediately a conference was held; all the agencies got together and agreed among themselves that, with certain controls and certain cooperation, they could meet the emergency without legislation. So, in December, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, General Somervell and his associates, and several other agencies, came before our committee and told us that they were able then to take care of the situation. But additional demands have been made since the beginning of the year, and they now need, I believe, some added controls unless the workers are forthcoming.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator stated a few moments ago—and his statement was true—that the optimistic reports or statements made by high officials about the termination of the war in Europe led to a movement of employees from one industry to another so as to obtain permanent positions in life. It seems to me the time has come for somebody in high position to say that the ending of the war in Europe does not mean the disbandment of the Navy and the Army. The information most of us are able to get is that the war against Japan may last from 2 to 4 years, and that the end of the European war will simply mean the transfer of the Army and Navy and the entire war effort into the Pacific Ocean area. If that is known it ought to end the belief which is prevalent that as soon as the European fight is over the war itself is practically over.

Mr. MEAD. That is a valuable contribution, and I appreciate it.

This committee has heard the story before. We risked disrupting production about a year ago when we made our own survey of one of the largest airplane plants. That plant's labor shortage of over 10,000 workers proved wholly fictitious once the people on the job really got to work. And in most instances the workers prefer to do a good job.

The War Manpower Commission must be empowered to do plant surveys wherever they are needed. It must be staffed to accomplish this job. It must be permitted full access to records and to books. It must be able to question witnesses under oath. It must have power to force action on its findings. It must have this power now. Management and labor must cooperate to get this done. There are too many inefficient plants where workers anxious to work are not given enough to keep them busy.

Malutilization of labor is not all that is wrong. In our last report to the Senate this committee pointed out some of the slack practices in our procurement system which result in waste of manpower. We called attention to poor overall planning, to overbuying, to duplication of procurement, to wasted transportation, to inefficient storing, to poor inventory control, and to other wasteful practices. It is up to the armed forces and the other procurement agencies to eliminate these conditions.

I will say for the armed forces that they are doing a remarkable job, taking it by percentages, but now when we are scraping the barrel it is up to them to refine their work so that none of these inefficiencies will remain if it is possible to eliminate them.

An excellent example of what can be done is the solution of the serious bottleneck problem in foundries. This problem was solved in the case of the heavy tire industry some 6 or 8 months ago, although there is now an apparent need for additional personnel there. The foundries have raised some of the most troublesome of our production problems. Thousands of men were said to be required to cure the situation. Meanwhile vital war programs were held up for lack of castings. The dilemma was solved by rescheduling the work in the foundries in order to put first things first. That was done by the Army. As a result, the foundry situation is now largely corrected. Throwing labor into the plants is not the answer to all the problems. Management and government must do their share, too.

Labor efficiency also was increased in the foundries as a result of a survey by the War Manpower Commission which resulted in the productivity of individual foundries being increased by as much as 53 percent. The results of this survey are just beginning to become apparent. It is interesting to note that one plant which did not cooperate made one of the worst records. Complete cooperation with the War Manpower Commission in such surveys is essential today. Where such cooperation prevails there is always increased efficiency.

We must also find ways to use perfectly good labor which is available. The committee is informed that at least 20,000 workers who had previously worked

in war plants are now idle in Detroit. We are advised that thousands of Negroes, including skilled workers, are unable to obtain war work in many parts of the country.

There is still unemployment in many communities despite the urgent need for workers elsewhere.

The procurement agencies are now hastening to award new contracts in the areas which have most workers available, and that will be very helpful; but the present situation is not helped by the fact that in the last few months contracts have been allowed to expire in places where workers were available while more work was piled into the critical labor areas. Both shipbuilding and munitions contracts were placed in critical west coast areas, while in other sections plants with labor available were passed by.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. How are we going to remedy that situation? The argument the Senator is making is one which leads to what he and I are, I believe, both opposed, namely, the drafting of labor. Yet the facts which the Senator presents almost raise in the mind the necessity of it. Is there any other method of handling the problem where there is a shortage of labor in one place and a superabundance of it in another?

Mr. MEAD. We have been assured that withdrawing contracts where labor is available, and increasing contracts in areas where labor is not available, will be eliminated so far as possible. That has not been eliminated, but excellent control is already in the hands of the proper procurement agencies. They can, in a survey of the field, place contracts where there is available labor, and they can discontinue withdrawing contracts where there is labor available. They have excellent controls if they cooperate, one agency with another, and do a good, over-all job with the power they have.

Mr. WALSH. Who could give us information today, or in the next day or two, as to the areas in which there is a surplus of labor, and in what areas there is a shortage? Is there some authority that could give us the information?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. Who is it?

Mr. MEAD. I imagine the information could be secured from the War Manpower Commission, and from certain branches of the War Production Board.

Mr. WALSH. What, if anything, is being done to level out that uneven surface?

Mr. MEAD. We are told contracts are now being placed where there is labor available, and are being withdrawn where there is a shortage of labor.

Mr. WALSH. That would help.

Mr. MEAD. For instance, some time ago there were cut-backs in the airplane industry. Some time ago there was a severe cut-back in aluminum production, and a number of plants were closed. In some cases aluminum plants, which were the main sources of employment in the

communities, were closed, and no conversion of the aluminum plants was ordered, with the result that there was quite a surplus of labor available.

Mr. WALSH. I assume the Senator feels as I do at present, antagonistic to our reaching the point where we would have to draft labor, and I feel very strongly we should have accurate figures as to the extent to which there is a surplus of labor in the market, exactly what the needs are, and how important all those factors are to the war effort.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may say something on the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think a prize illustration of the point in question was the Corsair contract of the Navy, which was divided among three plants—namely, Chance Vought who were the designers of the Corsair, and of course did the engineering work; Goodyear, in Akron, and Brewster, of Long Island and southern Pennsylvania. When it became necessary to cut back the Corsair contract, as it was cut back, Goodyear was in a critical labor area, where the tire plants were crying for more workers. It was also in a Government-owned plant. So that Goodyear would not be hurt financially by the cut-back. Brewster was a privately owned concern in a noncritical area. Unfortunately, Brewster was shut down, and Goodyear permitted to go ahead at the same time when labor could not be found for the tire plants.

Another point which I think may be of interest is the conflict which possibly, I fear, civil-service rules may contribute to the troubles in the Norfolk Navy Yard. The Navy, I think with the proper idea, went into its navy yards, like that at Norfolk, and subcontracted from the congested area into smaller plants great quantities of work, but unfortunately the personnel of the navy yard was not cut commensurately at the time. They still held it, and I greatly fear it was due to the fact that civil-service ratings for supervisors are based upon number of employees on the job. In other words, a man's rating all too frequently was based on the number of men who worked under him, and naturally a supervisor did not want to have the personnel cut down, because that would mean he would have to take a cut in pay.

Mr. WALSH. The making of the regulations is a result of the recommendations of the workmen themselves.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. These recommendations are largely the result of pressure of the labor organizations in groups in these yards upon the Army and Navy to enforce the standards they have set up.

Mr. KILGORE. These yards are not organized, so far as unions are concerned.

Mr. WALSH. They have their own unions, their own organizations.

Mr. KILGORE. No; it is not a labor-organization matter at all. Approximately 60 percent of the men in the yard, we were informed, belonged to the union, and 40 percent did not belong to it.

Mr. WALSH. That is, at Norfolk?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; so it is not a labor-union situation.

Mr. WALSH. Delegations come to me from labor unions in Norfolk.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, yes; they are recognized, but it is not what we would call a closed shop, by any means. About 40 percent of the employees are nonunion employees, but the trouble with the situation I think is the fact that the yards have not gotten over their normal peacetime methods of operation; in the lower levels they are still operating as they operated in time of peace.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to conclude in a moment or two. The Senator from Massachusetts has made a very helpful contribution to the discussion.

The armed forces also must clean their houses—not only their arsenals and navy yards, but also their actual uniformed ranks. There has been too much evidence of excess manpower in uniform. There are too many men now assigned to nonproductive jobs, whom the armed services either will not or cannot shift to useful work. These men complain that they have not enough to do. They should either be utilized in uniform or released to industry.

This country will back up its fighting men. It will give them the munitions they need. But our people just cannot act blindly. American people want the facts, and they want to know what is being done about the facts. This country will stand for compulsory labor if it is shown it is necessary to win the war.

Labor, industry, and agriculture will make any sacrifice to meet our military needs. In fact, their spokesmen have only very recently appeared before congressional committees and assured us of their fullest cooperation. Let us give them the facts, and put them to work. They will not shirk their responsibility. Our committee will continue its study of manpower utilization, and a committee report will be considered later and presented to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say, before I take my seat, that very recently there has been a change in management at the Norfolk Navy Yard. A new admiral has been appointed as commandant of the yard, and a new captain has been appointed in charge of the industrial productivity of the yard.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the important office that of the industrial manager of the yard?

Mr. MEAD. I think that would be an important office.

Mr. WALSH. The commanding officer comes and goes, but I think the industrial manager of the yard holds the important office. He is more likely to remain permanently. Nearly all labor problems finally go to him rather than to the commanding officer. Of course, the commanding officer has other duties.

Mr. MEAD. There are two major officers, one more or less in charge of the physical plant, and the naval personnel, who comes and goes. The other is in charge of the productivity, the industrial and engineering side of the plant.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. MEAD. I believe there is a need for change in the system. It is a com-

plicated system, and supervision and responsibility should be lodged more generally in the naval personnel.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator knows the reason for the condition. First of all, practically every officer in the Navy must be seagoing in time of peace. But it is not fair to keep a man 30 or 40 years of his life at sea, so after a certain period of time at sea, an officer is given a billet on shore commensurate with his training and ability, and many of the billets are in navy yards. I agree the problem is a serious one.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the testimony before our committee was to the effect that the average tour of duty of a naval officer is about 2 years, whereas none of the masters at Norfolk, so far as the Navy has any record, has ever been dismissed. They have retired on account of age. In order that one may be dismissed, the officials have to come to Washington and hold hearings. So it can be imagined that officers on duty at the yard for 2 years are not likely to tackle that kind of a proposition. The masters are a power unto themselves.

Mr. WALSH. And they resent official regulation, official direction. That is my observation. Just as the Senator has said, the presence of the conflict is apparent to anyone who studies the matter.

Mr. BALL. Let me make a remark in the Senator's time. In connection with the demand for a national service act, if now there are men who are being forced to loaf on the job, or stretch out work, because of inefficient management, and we pass a national service act and put more men to doing the same job, I think we will increase the problem, rather than solve it. I am concerned about that. It strikes me that in this picture, not only in the navy yards, but in too many private plants, management has been under no spur whatever to clean its own house and provide supervision which will get results. I understand that when the captain of a company or commander of a regiment falls down on the job in the field he is yanked off right then and there and replaced. That certainly has not been done with the executives who fail to deliver production at Norfolk, or in any other plant I have seen.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, I will say that there is one Navy establishment in this country—and I hope the committee will visit it—which is manned and controlled and operated entirely by officers and enlisted personnel. That is the one at San Diego. It is apparently very successful. The committee will learn some lessons by visiting that yard. I have visited it and have contrasted the system employed there with the other system. Of course, it is unbelievable that we can change over from the present system of civilian control because it has been so long established.

Mr. KILGORE. Is that not purely a repair yard?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.



Mr. KILGORE. No new construction is done there?

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to point out that we on this side of the Chamber cannot hear the Senator from Massachusetts. We would be glad to hear everything that is being said.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I regret that we have not spoken louder during the debate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the present situation is a serious one. It needs to be solved now. We need the ships badly. Therefore, I would recommend to the Navy that it immediately institute an all-out manpower utilization survey by experts, which I understand can be furnished to the Navy by the War Manpower Commission; that the Navy put its house in order; and then, as a long-range program, let us get at the system which my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts, points out is in need of improvement and refinement. If the two programs are accomplished, I am sure that a good deal of this difficulty will be behind us.

I wish to conclude by saying that the naval officers have cooperated with us in this survey in every yard, and I wish also to add that labor has very generally and enthusiastically embraced the opportunity for a thoroughgoing utilization of the manpower needs in our navy yards.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, addressing myself to the subject which has been discussed by my colleague on the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], I wish to be a little more specific as to what we found at Norfolk in an examination of the navy yard there. I think the time has come when we must speak out. We must make these investigations and we must give the results to the people as soon as possible, so that a remedy may be found for the condition which exists. What was presented by the Senator from New York is not a report of what we have found, and I am sure the able Senator from New York was not intending to make a report from the committee.

Mr. President, I feel called upon today to say something in reply to certain remarks made by the Under Secretary of the Navy, and I want to be specific with reference to them. I shall be frank to the Senate and to my fellow citizens of America.

On the 17th day of January this year, when we went through the Norfolk Navy Yard and took the testimony of 27 witnesses, comprising 375 pages, I personally was shocked that such a condition could exist in our country at this time and, as the Under Secretary of the Navy says, I did remark that I found conditions in the navy yard at Norfolk amounting almost to the point of treason. The definition of treason, my fellow Senators, is merely the giving of aid and comfort to the enemy. The able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] today in indicating his thought with respect to what had happened in that navy yard based on the report of the able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] used the word "sabotage."

Mr. President, I shall make a statement as to what we found at the navy yard, so that all may judge what the conditions are.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I did not comment on any facts, but I did say that if men were whispering to other men, "Go slow; let up; do not produce it," it was a form of sabotage, which is the same thing that the Senator said.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, among other things, I had anticipated complete cooperation upon the part of the Navy in the solution of this problem. I feel certain that the great majority of officers in the Navy if not every one of them, when the conditions which prevail have been brought to their attention and they realize the situation, will cooperate to the fullest, as I know that Congress is going to cooperate.

What I shall discuss deals merely with the utilization of labor. It has nothing to do with any recommendation by the President as to what we should do with respect to any bill to provide labor for these plants. I think our first job is immediately—it is long past due—to look into the utilization of every man and every woman in America toward the winning of the war. My only reason for saying what I say today is that I want to cooperate with the various agencies in order that we may get every ounce of effort out of our citizens in the winning of the war.

Mr. President, I wish to read most of a letter written by the Under Secretary of the Navy in order that we may know the attitude of one who is high in power and authority over the very conditions the committee has investigated. The Under Secretary said in his letter:

This is a serious charge against a loyal and able unit of the Naval Establishment which I cannot let pass unanswered.

Mr. President, no one is more loyal to the fighting Navy of the United States and to every man who is rendering service out on the high seas and on shore than I am. It is by reason of my devotion to the Navy that I have made my statement, because I believe it to be substantiated by the evidence, and I think the time has come not only in the shipyard in question but everywhere, when we should demand that every individual in the United States, no matter what his position may be, whether it be high or low, do his utmost toward the winning of the war; that everyone should exert every ounce of his efforts to the winning of the war, and when he does not do that, but is in a position where he is loafing and giving aid and comfort to the enemy, then a proper description of his action is almost that of treason or sabotage, for it interferes with the prosecution of this war, which we must win.

He further states that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, including its labor utilization record, is good. Mr. President, today I had the privilege of seeing a report to the Under Secretary

of the Navy showing that the utilization of labor was not good. I am unable to bring that report to the floor of the Senate. Let me read some excerpts from it. The report was made in December 1944.

I shall not overestimate what we found. A fair, mild description of what we found will speak volumes to the Senate and to the American people as to the results of failure fully to utilize the labor in this yard. Reading from the report, under the heading "Utilization," we find the following:

It is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

Mr. President, how does that line up with the letter which was released by the Under Secretary to the press on Saturday evening? He says that during 1944 the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, including its labor utilization record, was good. Later I shall read further from the report which I have described, but at this point I wish to read the following:

Idle time: Idle time, as used here, includes plain loafing, which is the employee's own fault.

Mr. President, are we going to blame the employee himself, and not supervision, up to the highest ranking supervisor, for so-called loafing, and are we to say that it is the employee's own fault? I read further from the report:

Stand-by time: When men are idle due to no fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for furnishing of instructions.

Mr. President, whose fault is that? The testimony in this record shows that a man receiving \$1.26 an hour spent 4 days, with a helper, waiting for four screws; that he complained, and was told by the leaderman to go back and stay there until the screws arrived. When the four screws arrived, he required 1 minute to put them in.

Mr. President, that is a sworn statement. I believe it, and I believe that every other member of the committee believes it.

Another man testified that in January of this year he and two other men waited 4 days in a place where the work which they were supposed to do had already been done. He stated the days he waited there—Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

In this organization in many instances it is not exactly clear as to just who is in authority. Today we heard with great interest a description of the authority, from the top down. The Bureau of Yards and Docks has certain authority. The Bureau of Ships has certain authority. As we go down the line of authority, we find a commandant in the yard. He is an admiral. Under him we find a captain, who is the manager of the yard. As between those two, the division of authority is very clear; but when we go from the Navy official side into the so-called civil-service side, it is not clear.

Coming up the ladder from the bottom, in the line of so-called supervision, we have first the snapper. Next we have

the keyman. Those two men have no particular authority, except that given to them by the leaderman, who comes next. Next in the scale we have the leaderman, and then the quartermen. Next we have the chief quartermen, then the foreman, and then the master.

It was testified that there are many good men in the yard who would be able to do the job of supervision. Most of the men who testified before the committee had more than 4 years of experience. They were good, loyal American citizens, and wanted to do a job, but because of circumstances and conditions they felt that they were unable to do it.

The evidence clearly shows that men who had been there for only a short time were up-graded, above men who had been there for years.

There is no complaint from the top because of not having work to do. The chief occupation of those at the top seems to be defending themselves. I appreciate that one of the first instincts of man is to defend himself when he is accused. One witness, who had been in the yard for 4 years and 3 months, had never seen the master, and had seen his chief quartermen only half a dozen times during that period. The testimony shows that men were not laid off because of lack of work, but that men were recruited during this entire period. At the present time they are taking on all the labor they can get. The figures show that at present, as of the 1st day of January, there are 37,578 men working in that navy yard. January 20 is the last day for which I have a report. Up to January 20, 2,012 men have been hired. In the meantime 839 men have been lost. The quota is said to be 40,000; and the yard is said to be in need of men up to that number.

Mr. President, there are 16 masters in this yard. Men who have been there for a long time say that they have never known a master to be discharged from a shipyard for inefficiency. Some of the witnesses told of the conduct of the masters. Some of the things they do seem small, but they have a great effect upon the spirit of the men. Witnesses told of one master going through the plant and breaking up 15 or 20 stools on which the men were sitting. In a few days it was necessary for the Government to replace the stools. In his letter, the Under Secretary tells us that such things represent an expense of only a few hundred dollars; but, Mr. President, they mean more than that. They affect the morale and spirit of the men.

Witness after witness testified that 50-percent production was all that was being obtained in connection with building new ships. Only one man testified that it would run as high as 75 or 80 percent. He was in the pattern-making department. The peculiar thing was that when the master testified before the committee, the only department which he said did not have enough work to do was the pattern department. The other testimony all showed that that was the only department which had enough work to keep the men busy. The witness from the pattern department stated that he felt that up to 80-percent production was being obtained in that department.

I have spoken of the men who were working on the *Champlain*. That is a carrier, and it is needed at sea as soon as it can be put in the water. One man testified that on a certain Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday he and two other men were sent to do certain work when the leaderman knew that there was no work for them to do, and that it had already been done. Those three men were sent to a certain place and stayed there during that period.

Another witness testified that on the very day they had told the leaderman they needed a welder for a short job, the leaderman insisted on sending the welder there and having her remain all day; that the welder actually worked in the morning from 9:05 until 9:25, and then waited until 2:25, and then worked until 2:30—just 5 minutes. The witness estimated that the Government would have to pay that welder for the actual work done, on an hourly basis. He said that if the welder was paid on an hourly basis, the payment would amount to \$23.46.

Another witness who testified about timing the workers, said that in connection with work on Sundays, he had timed a person who was going to the rest room. He testified that the first time that person went to the rest room he stayed 45 minutes; that he had gone there four times that particular day; and that he had spent a little more than 3 hours in the shop. That was on the Sunday previous to our going there.

Another witness testified that he saw loafing in the storeroom 25 or 30 men who claimed they did not have anything to do. The witness testified that the leaderman came along and told them to go down into the ship and hide, that the storeroom was not the proper place for them to be loafing.

There is considerable testimony in the record that only approximately 50 percent of the time is spent on essential work. A witness testified about jobs being overmanned. He said that if 10 men can do a job, they will send 20 to do it, and that actually one is in the way of another. Representatives of the metal trades testified that so many persons were put into a room that they could not work, that they had lack of supervision, that there was featherbedding, and that they had to wait for the crafts to finish the job. One man described working in a room 12 feet by 12 feet, with a smoke-stack going up through the center of it. He testified that 10 men were sent to that room and that there was not sufficient space for all 10 men to work there, so some had to go outside and come back later to relieve others who had been working.

The wages paid joiners—in other words, expert carpenters—are \$1.26 an hour. A lay-out man is paid \$1.32 an hour. Not all the men were union members. Some of them were nonunion men. It is not a closed shop, according to evidence we received from both sides. Some of the men testified before the committee that they had belonged to a union previously, but that they were not then members.

The working hours there are 9 hours a day. The men are paid for 9½ hours. They work three Sundays each month.

Later I shall read what the Navy's report of last December shows in that connection.

The testimony shows beyond the possibility of contradiction that 15 minutes before the whistle blows the men leave their jobs, and when they come back it is 15 or 20 minutes before they return to the jobs. The testimony was that some of the men were not doing anything at all that day.

On one of the new ships at almost any time of the day, the testimony shows, one could see on the flight deck and on the hangar deck from 100 to 150 men who were not working. About 10 minutes before the whistle blows, a witness testifies, one could see a thousand men upon those decks, waiting, before quitting time, to get off.

The testimony shows that if you go down into a hold you probably will find only 1 out of 10 men or, as the witness stated, only 1 out of 8 men working. I personally observed conditions on one of the top decks of this carrier. Not more than 1 man in 10 was working. I am sure other members of the committee observed the same condition. However, at this same time, we are advised that, according to the War Manpower Commission—and let me say that the Commission cooperated with us in the survey, and representatives of the Commission went there with us—4,400 more men are now needed.

One workman described a good workman as follows: One who is in good attendance, one who has a good bond-drive record and who makes good donations to the collections. The witness said he would be a fine man. Mr. President, no one wishes to hinder the selling of bonds and the making of the various collections; but it appears to me that the actual workman has a further duty, besides merely the buying of bonds. The bond is sold to help pay him and others for their work, and to enable the Government to employ sufficient men to do the needed work, each of them to do a day's work in return for the wages paid by means of the bonds which he and his fellow citizens are buying.

With respect to the "slow-down," a witness testified he was told to make the job last. The work is stretched out. A witness said that when the work load is not up to what it could be and jobs are scarce, he was told to say, "I can stretch it." At that time that condition was general in the ship. The witness said, "You can stretch it out double." One man said he had not been ordered to stretch it, but that it is the natural thing to do when they see what is going on around them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. To me, that is the worst of all the conditions complained about.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very serious.

Mr. WALSH. If in that yard or in any other yard there is a conspiracy among Government workers to stretch out the work and to slow down produc-



tion, it is a very serious offense, in my opinion, and I am sure the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator's committee will investigate that matter to the core, and will find out who are the leaders, and will have them prosecuted, and also will find out who are the superiors in that navy yard, or in the Navy, who should know about the situation but have done nothing to correct it.

To me that condition is inconceivable. I can understand loafing; I can understand an inferior type of labor which the navy yards are obliged to hire; I can understand that civil-service regulations may tie the hands of the management so that it is not always to be able to get the best and most efficient labor; but if there is a spirit of "take it easy and do not produce too much," that is intolerable, and to me it is unbelievable.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the able senior Senator from Massachusetts state his views in that connection. I feel wholeheartedly, as he does, that we must go to the bottom of these matters, we must bring them to light, and that prosecution should be had in all cases in which it is warranted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not the Senator's opinion, from the testimony in the hearings, that statements about the existence of such a spirit did not emanate from the individual workers themselves, but that the workers received such an impression as a result of being told, "This is all we see in sight"? So they gained the impression that they had better make that much last. Was not that the situation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Exactly.

Mr. KILGORE. That was testified to by witness after witness, and they "kicked" because they did not have enough work; because, as the Senator has said, the witnesses stated, "When we work all day and are busy the work goes fast and the day is short."

I believe the Senator will remember two or three witnesses who made that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and they said that 8 hours was a long time when they had nothing to do.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What the Senator means is that a certain portion of the work was being assigned to a certain group of men, and that when it had been performed and there were no more orders from Washington, or from the Navy Department, the men had to be dropped from employment, or the work had to be stretched out.

Mr. KILGORE. The leadman would say, "This is all the job we have in sight." Whereupon the men would proceed to stretch out the job.

Mr. WALSH. From time to time various persons from the navy yard

have visited me and asked that contracts be procured and sent to this yard or that yard. When they had finished the job on which they were engaged, and it was perhaps necessary for some men to be dropped from employment, the union's representatives came and asked for more work.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that one of the causes for the unnatural slowdown in work has been described by some of the witnesses as the subcontracting of work to other yards. As they said, the workmen protested against the situation and often went to the higher-ups. A job was brought in at a time when 300 men were idle or off the pay roll. It would have taken 4 or 5 months to complete it. The employees tried to get their superior officers to keep the work in that particular yard, but it was sent to another yard. As a natural consequence, the men slowed down in the performance of their work.

Mr. President, I believe that another thing which causes men to slow down is the so-called private work in the yard. I wish to describe that rather in detail because of the effect it has upon the morale of the men. One of the most difficult things the men have to do is to make a survey of the yard. We appreciate Cook's Tours. We know what is coming, but in the past 2 or 3 years we have been able to look around and observe and not be taken on a Cook's Tour through the plant, as was described by the able Senator from New York. So on one trip we split up into subcommittees and went into various buildings without any previous notice having been given.

The reason I say that private work affects the morale of the men is that, as I was going through the plant, I fell behind and spoke to a workman, and out of the side of his mouth, in a whisper so that the officials could not hear him, he said, "Look for an oyster-shucking table over in the corner." Another one said, "Look for some picture frames over in the corner." Another one remarked to me, "Look for a checkerboard, or three of them, down in the lower room." I shall have something to say about those various matters. The situation which I have described is contagious. It affects every one of the employees. Each knows what is going on, and it breaks down the spirit and the desire to produce.

The record shows that much work was done on private orders. A witness stated that when there was technical work to be done, if a private work job came in they dropped the work which they were doing in order to do the private work, which came first.

Sitting in the shop among the private items to be worked upon was a small safe belonging to a lieutenant. It was a metal case only a foot by a foot in size. It was equipped with a lock. But it had been brought in, and the men had considered it as a private job. They had installed small drawers in the safe. They had even lined it with green felt. I obtained the time card on that particular safe. On the 13th day of January 1945 there was expended \$16.20 worth of labor, and on January 15, \$10.83 worth of labor, or a total of \$27.03

which represented the cost of the job. It had not yet been finished, and workmen in that yard considered it a private piece of work for the lieutenant. It affected the morale of not only the particular workman who told me to look at it, but of all the other workmen, because information concerning it went out over the yard.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What was the private work to which the Senator refers? Was it work done for an officer, or for a private individual, for which no payment was made?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was done for either an officer, a master, or a civil-service employee, and the men felt that it had no direct relationship to the war.

Mr. WALSH. Was it a naval job?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Did the safe come from a naval vessel?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was it going back to the naval vessel?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it was going into the office of the lieutenant.

Mr. WALSH. Was it going to the office of the lieutenant, or to his home?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was going into his office.

Mr. WALSH. So it was being moved from a ship for use in the lieutenant's new job in some office capacity. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should not put it in that way.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand a little more about the situation, perhaps, than does the Senator from Michigan. The cabinet was a little steel cabinet about 12 by 12 inches in size.

Mr. WALSH. Was it a private job being done for a naval officer, and was it for his own individual use?

Mr. KILGORE. The theory was that it was to be used in his office. The officer is said to have stated, "I got this off the salvage pile and brought it in to have it fixed up for my own office, because everyone else has one like it." It was not a safe. It was a small steel cabinet which would correspond to a dispatch case.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator says that it was being repaired.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was there any evidence that it was a private job, and that the employees of the yard were repairing the cabinet for private use?

Mr. KILGORE. The empty box, without the felt-lined compartments, could have been used.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with that statement. If a naval officer asks to have a box, a safe, or some other article changed or modified for use by the Navy, that may be extravagant. On the other hand, if he asks one or more employees to repair something for him personally in their own time, that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator, but I also believe that there is too much divergence of the employee's time

when he has to do what was done in this case.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few minutes on the work in the lucite room.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before proceeding, will the Senator say how much the work to which he has referred amounted to altogether? Was it a considerable amount, or was it limited to the particular case which he cited?

Mr. FERGUSON. The work was considerable. I shall try to describe some other things as I proceed, showing that the amount of work was considerable.

I wish to describe the work in the lucite room, and state what we found in going through the room. It was only a small office, not more than 15 feet square. It may possibly have been 20 feet square. It was a workshop. Outside we found about 398 sheets of scarce lucite, and the testimony disclosed that all of it had been ordered out of the warehouse, and to be stored outside the door of the lucite room. It had been there from August, and one of the witnesses said it was worth \$18.75 a sheet and there were about 398 sheets. He said that it was placed there and had remained there. They could not tell us whether it was surplus or what it was, but it could not be declared to be surplus so long as it was outside of that small office on this floor. It merely shows how this material was handled.

This witness described the taking of lumber, large timbers, to a dump and being burned there. It was claimed they were good timbers.

Another witness, by affidavit, showed that 100,000 gallons of Diesel oil were pumped into a sludge oil tank to dispose of it. Another witness described how workmen tore down their benches and built them up again because they wanted to keep busy at work, although benches were in good condition and needed no repairs.

One of the chief complaints, which came from another witness was concerning the destruction of insulation. It was stated that insulation work would be done three times. It would be put on, and then the electricians would come along and say they had not done their work and the insulation would be removed. Then the steam fitters or pipe fitters would come along and say "we have not done our work." So, as the testimony shows, much insulation was destroyed because the pipes which had been put under this insulation had not been tested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. After hearing the witnesses testify—and I presume publicly so that the persons responsible for the wastage which the Senator describes had an opportunity of rebuttal and an opportunity to deny—that valuable timber was destroyed by fire and that all these other wastages had oc-

curred, did they have an opportunity to refute that testimony?

Mr. FERGUSON. They were asked about it. This was in executive session and the witnesses were sworn in executive session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Were the persons responsible who were informed of these facts have an opportunity to reply?

Mr. FERGUSON. They were asked about these various facts, and there was a defense for most of the conditions, and a lack of knowledge as to others.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to explain to the Senator from Massachusetts the regulations so that he will understand. Up to some months ago this lucite, which is in sheets of 40 by 50 and a quarter-inch thick, clear plastic, was used for plotting boards on battleships, carriers, and cruisers, and of course, was necessary in navy yards. It was discovered that it would bend when it was leaned on, so a new and much better glass was devised, and glass was substituted, and the lucite was placed in a warehouse. So that it might be declared surplus, they had it brought to the lucite room where it could go into surplus. It got out of the hands of the property man, who could have declared it surplus and use it for airplane construction, for which it is very valuable, and it went to the lucite room and was stored there. There was lack of proper supervision; somebody should have seen to it that proper steps were taken to declare it surplus.

Mr. WALSH. I want to say this to both Senators: My interest as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is to get at the facts and take action. I want to know if as a result of the committee's investigation we should take action to remove the Secretary of the Navy or the commanding officer of the navy yard in question. Who is the man we can put our hands on to make an example of. This disclosure should be beneficial in every navy yard, and should make them cautious for the time being; but should not drastic action be taken in the case of someone to whom we can tie this burning of valuable lumber and the wasteful practices referred to here? They may not be of very great importance in themselves individually, but several of them show that there has been laxity on the part of someone. Who is the person against whom we can take action rather than merely discuss these matters in these debates and hear this presentation? Even the discussion will be of benefit, because it will be read in all the navy yards and there will be a change for the time being; but I think the committee could say, "This man or that man ought to be fired," and let us go to the Navy Department and demand that it be done.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that the point I was trying to make regarding lucite I did not fully develop.

There are some terrific weaknesses in the regulations that do not go to the human element at all, but are due to peacetime weaknesses which have not been corrected to take care of this vast construction.

For instance the granting of over-all job orders, signed by the master mechanic, which run for a period of 30 days or so, on which all kinds of jobs can be done, some necessary and many unnecessary, without any real appropriation, so that they could be charged up to construction. Such a condition indicates that amendments are needed, which the Senator's committee could go into.

Mr. WALSH. My committee does not make regulations.

Mr. KILGORE. In my opinion, it is not a function of the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH. We could be helpful.

Mr. KILGORE. The committee of which the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman should make a recommendation that the regulations be changed.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Senator from Michigan is making merely a preliminary report?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. The committee comes here with mere suggestions rather than a report. Who are the men loafing on the job? Who are those who are derelict? Is it a naval officer who is incompetent or is it the master mechanic or is it some other master? Is there not some one in this navy yard or other navy yards of whom we can make an example, so as to give some assurance that it will not happen again?

Mr. KILGORE. One factor is that the naval officer on the job who should know what is going on is not kept there long but is sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. No matter how long he is there, he ought to know enough to have subordinate officers in whom he has confidence to know what is going on and to submit reports.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that we took the superintendent of every shop in all the yards with us, so that everything we found we were very sure was discovered when they were present, so they would understand.

Mr. WALSH. Did they make any reply to these things? Where is the Navy's explanation?

Mr. FERGUSON. They have no explanation.

Mr. WALSH. Have they not made any?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy sent me a memorandum about some of these things. One was about a safe that had been taken off a submarine and was going into an office to be used for the safe-keeping of bonds and radio parts. That is their explanation about that. I do not know whether it was correct or not, but I suppose the committee would ask the Navy as to each one of these items.

Mr. FERGUSON. We did; we had the Navy officers before us this morning. The difficulty is that the managers change.

Mr. WALSH. Do they say these things are true and that they are responsible, or do they say that the system is wrong and they cannot control the carelessness on



the part of employees. What is their answer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Their answer is that the naval officer who had been there had been sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. Was he the commanding officer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they have a commanding officer and the manager.

Mr. WALSH. So that the answer is that the commanding officer who knew about it was sent to sea, and did not take any action.

Mr. FERGUSON. They do not admit he knew about it, and they say they did not let him go to sea because of his work or because of this adverse report.

Mr. WALSH. Did not some master mechanic know about these things? Certainly there is some individual higher up than these poor workmen whom we can discipline for this condition and not, as the result of these disclosures, resort to a drastic law to draft labor. Can we not correct it by punishing, if it be possible, those in executive positions?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we can; I am sure we can. I shall do everything I can to get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator will try to see if we cannot set an example once for all. As I have said, the evidence is helpful in that it will be read in every navy yard and every arsenal, and it will have a beneficial effect, but the most valuable thing of all would be to have some executive held responsible and punished—a naval officer, if it is a naval matter, a civilian, if it is a civilian. But we would have trouble removing any civilian without evidence, because there are civil-service regulations for their protection. Charges must be preferred and proven.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the orders, and the method of indicating the amount of labor to be used on a particular order that has helped and hurt labor and caused excessive costs.

There is a pink-slip order. The orders are not numbered consecutively, so that one uses it or does not use it as he pleases, but if one uses one of those pink slips, he puts on it the amount of labor he anticipates being necessary.

One witness describes it in this way, that if it would take \$25 worth of labor to do a job, \$125 might be indicated upon the slip, and then they make sure that that much labor is charged on that slip against that particular job.

I wish to take one particular order number, that is, order No. X-8140. This comes out of the foundry, and as I was going through this shop, a witness told me that there was an oyster-shucking table over in the corner. I was curious to know how an oyster-shucking table was going to help win the war, so I went over and looked at it, and this is what I discovered. It had an order number, No. X-8140. Here is the diagram, Exhibit 1, showing what this oyster table was. It is made out of fir. It is cabinet work. They were careful to see that all the screws were countersunk and the edges smoothed. It is 16 feet long. It has a backboard 12 inches high. It has a depth of 45 inches. It has 4 holes in it, through which oyster shells can be

dropped. The holes are 5 inches by 5 inches. The table has four highly polished oak blocks, 4 by 2 inches, hollowed out so that an oyster may be placed in the block and be shucked much easier. One man described working a whole half day on the blocks.

There was an explanation for that. The statement had been made that commandants come and go, but the masters stay on forever. The explanation was that the masters were going to have an oyster party in their closed room in the cafeteria, and they had that one board made. The officials say in a letter to me that the actual cost of the board was \$14.60, \$11.97 in labor, and \$2.63 in material.

Mr. President, I should like to have every Member of the Senate look at that board, which is here as an exhibit. I think it would be good for the Under Secretary to see the board.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Who issued the order?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Williams, the master in the joiners' department.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator permit the order to be placed in the Record?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall ask to place it in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the Record.

[Order omitted from Record under rules of Joint Committee on Printing.]

Mr. WALSH. What was the oyster board to be used for, and where was it to be used?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was to be used in the cafeteria for a party given by the masters on Friday night; we were there on Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. WALSH. So that this master issued an order to have made, at Government expense, with Government labor, a board or table which was to be used in shucking oysters at a masters' party. Is that the story?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. What action has been taken against that man?

Mr. FERGUSON. So far as I know, no action has been taken by the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Do they know the man's name?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Under Secretary of the Navy defends the making of this board as a morale builder.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, his claim is that the masters have clubs, like all officers and enlisted personnel, and that this was an adjunct of their club, which was on the Navy premises and used by the masters, instead of by enlisted men or by officers?

Mr. FERGUSON. Here is the express language:

It is true that a woodworker in the Norfolk Navy Yard built an oyster shucking board. The total cost in labor and material was exactly \$14.60, or \$11.97 in labor and \$2.63 in material. This oyster shucking board was built to protect one of the yard's cafeteria table tops during an oyster roast which was being given for morale purposes in the yard.

Mr. WALSH. What does the Under Secretary mean by "morale purposes"?

Does he mean that the existence of these clubs helped to create a good morale?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not been able to discover just what is meant by "morale" when speaking in connection with either management or labor. I think it is one of those words which is general in its nature, and if one wants an excuse for doing anything one can say that it is for morale purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that the only club I found in the yard was the masters' club. Other personnel apparently do not have access to it. Only the masters have access to it. Not even the admiral has a key to it, nor does the custodian.

Mr. WALSH. It would seem from some of the allegations, that "brass hats" ought to be taken off the admirals and placed on the masters in the navy yards.

Mr. KILGORE. I said so at the outset.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to be more difficult to get rid of them than it is to get rid of "brass hats."

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me to interrupt him further, I may say that the reason responsibility cannot be fixed for this thing is that it is being done under one of those general job orders which runs for months, and such a thing as this is simply sandwiched in under verbal request. I do not know what job order this particular thing happened to be charged up to, but responsibility cannot be fixed because the name of the man who issued the order cannot be found.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the order show the name?

Mr. KILGORE. No. Only the general job order shows the name of the one who issued it. The Senator from Michigan will remember that some seven or eight hundred dollars' worth of work was done under that general job order.

Mr. FERGUSON. This particular order has the name on it.

Mr. WALSH. If the individual whose name appeared on the order were asked about it he might say that this work was not contained in the general job order, but that someone down the line did not know that, and ordered the work to be done. The Senator speaks of a general order; that the work would be said to come under a general order, and the individual who performed it therefore would not be subject to blame?

Mr. KILGORE. In tracing the matter down, I will say to the Senator, the work came on the general job order, and one master signed that order.

Mr. FERGUSON. The sketch or print they were going to use was signed.

By an examination of the records with respect to this job number X-8140 one cannot distinguish what labor devoted to the particular work. Therefore they can cover it up by putting it under the number of a general job order.

One thing, as I have said, which greatly concerns these workmen, and I think that it broke their spirit in a way, was the furniture which was made for the master's room. I should like to describe

it, because I think it is worth a description. It was made 8 months ago when we were straining every nerve to have ships constructed. The table in that room is 25 feet long and 4 feet wide. It is of solid mahogany. It has four massive legs under it. The foot under each leg is made of a piece of 12 by 4 solid walnut.

The carving of a claw on each one of these legs was made by one man, and it took him a day to make the particular carving. We were informed by that man himself that he spends 30 percent of his time on nonproductive so-called private work, not on work essential to winning the war. That table was built on the fourth floor of the shop. It was crated. It took 12 or 15 men several hours to take it down the elevator because the top of the table was 25 feet long and 4 feet wide, and they did not want to scar it.

They were not satisfied with making that table alone for the clubroom of the 16 masters. They made a large chair known as the master's chair to be placed at the head of that table. The same man carved the eagle of the United States and other designs upon that chair. They were not satisfied with that, but had to have a mirror with a carved eagle over the top of it in the rear of the table.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. Was an order issued for the making of this furniture for the masters' clubroom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer that just about as the testimony was given. We had great difficulty in finding out on whose order it was done. I state frankly that I believe the man committed perjury before our committee when he refused to tell us who the higher-up was who ordered this work done. We have asked them to try and find the order, but they expressed doubt that they ever would, because the orders have no serial numbers on them, and they disappear in a short time.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator visit this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I made a visit to it. The door was locked, but we got in finally.

Mr. WALSH. This furniture was all on display there?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Do the master mechanics contribute anything toward the support and maintenance of this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand not.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the Navy itself has contributed money toward it and permitted it to be furnished. I am trying to find out whether the master mechanics themselves did all this, or whether they had any approval from the Navy Department. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. FERGUSON. We failed in ascertaining the real authority for the construction of this furniture, because the witness testified at first that he knew but did not want to tell, and then finally he made up his mind he could not remember.

Mr. WALSH. Is the committee going to send all this testimony to the Navy Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is well. Is the committee also going to ask the Navy Department for an investigation and report?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Department made any report on the furniture to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it has not as yet reported.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Navy support and maintain this masters' club? Does it furnish the food and the refreshments and other things served there?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The masters pay 25 cents a meal—it has been increased to 30 cents—in the cafeteria, which is one of the rooms in the masters' club.

Mr. WALSH. So it is a club where the masters meet socially, and have their lunch in the middle of the day?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And they pay for their own lunch?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And manage it all themselves?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But they took advantage, apparently, from what the Senator has said, of their positions as masters, to have some furniture made at the Government's expense. It is important to know, it seems to me, whether the Navy officials higher up approved of that.

Mr. FERGUSON. As to that, we could not get an answer from the witness.

Mr. President, in relation to this club I wish to describe some things in the dining room. A sideboard was there. It looked as fine as any piece of Grand Rapids furniture. I pulled out a drawer immediately, knowing that Grand Rapids furniture makers usually place their label inside on a little plate. I could not find such a label. Then I was informed that that sideboard had been made at the navy yard. Two smaller sideboards were also made there. They were made of fine mahogany, and were of first-class workmanship.

In that room was something which came out of the so-called metal shop.

Mr. WALSH. Is the property now owned by the Navy or by this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is owned by the club of the masters, as I am informed.

Mr. WALSH. It is on Navy property?

Mr. FERGUSON. In the Navy Building.

Mr. WALSH. And so far as the Senator knows, the furniture in it is owned by the members of the masters' club?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The furniture has carved upon it "M M A", meaning "Master Mechanics' Association" and "N N Y", Norfolk Navy Yard, is graved by handcarving on all this furniture in the yard. This club has two large rooms, cut off from the central cafeteria, and is entered by a different entrance. We

were informed that it was for the exclusive use of the masters' association of the yard. The yard superintendent who was with us had difficulty in obtaining a key. Finally he had to locate a master in order to get into the club rooms.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Have the naval officers a club there?

Mr. KILGORE. There is a naval officers' club, but it has no connection with this club.

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to compare this station with other stations of which I have some knowledge. At other stations the naval officers have a club where they lunch.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And the masters have a club where they lunch. The enlisted personnel have places where they lunch, and the same is true of the civilian employees.

Mr. KILGORE. The civilian employees have only cafeterias.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that the masters are seeking to imitate the officers by having as luxurious a club as the naval officers have and by having the Navy supply them with furniture.

Mr. FERGUSON. This club is very much smaller than the officers' club.

Mr. President, in the dining room next to the club room was a steam table, made of stainless steel. It measured about 12 by 3½ feet, and was equipped with electrical connections so that the food could be kept warm. The men in the yard complained about the use of stainless steel for that purpose, when it was so urgently needed for war purposes. The workmanship on the table was of a high class, and many hours must have been required to build it. The room in which the steam table is used is not more than 25 or 30 feet from the kitchen. As these workmen testified, the furniture in this room was put there solely for the use of the masters. We have the testimony of men who are familiar with the construction of furniture. They say that it would cost as much as \$5,000 to make this furniture. The Under Secretary describes it in his letter as having a value of about \$200.

One other item which I wish to mention is the making of checkerboards. I can conceive that the making of checkerboards for the masters, who have idle time, may affect their so-called morale, and that a master may be enabled to go home at night and say to his family "My patriotism has been raised today because I have been able to play checkers at work." Some of the workmen described these boards as costing as much as \$50 in labor.

Mr. President, I think it is well that we know exactly what is done when these checkerboards are made. We were told that the checkerboards were in the lucite room. We asked to see them. The man to whom we talked denied that he had any checkerboards.



There were three of them there. I suggested to him that he come to the hotel room that evening and be prepared to take an oath about the checkerboards. By the time he reached the committee room, about 9 o'clock, he had a very vivid memory, so vivid that he could describe the checkerboards, and just how they were made. We had seen one of them in the master's room, and I suggested that it would be well for us to take one of them with us as an exhibit, so that the Under Secretary could see it and judge for himself.

I have before me today in the Senate Chamber a checkerboard made at Government expense. It is not an ordinary painted board. It is not made of cardboard; it is made of solid walnut. The white squares are inlaid with maple. On the border are the chess emblems—the knight, the rook, and so forth. Around the checkerboard there is inlaid a fine line of white maple, less than an eighth of an inch in width.

This board was being made by a man who claims that he is essential to the war effort and who is evading service in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. It was stated that he was making three such boards. The Under Secretary says that these boards are for the morale of the masters.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were these boards to be used in the masters' club?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the testimony.

Mr. WALSH. How many of them were there in all?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are 16 masters. There are now two checkerboards in the masters' club.

Mr. WALSH. How many boards were there in all?

Mr. FERGUSON. Three were being made at that particular time.

Mr. WALSH. Was the Senator able to obtain the orders for the making of those boards?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; we have not been able to obtain the orders for these particular boards.

Mr. WALSH. Apparently, from what the Senator is saying, the furniture for this club was made largely on Government working time, and with Government materials.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was made on Government working time and with Government materials.

Mr. WALSH. I infer from what the Senator says that he discovered, at least in some parts of the yard, a rather unfriendly, if not bitter, feeling on the part of the workmen toward the masters. Was that feeling extensive?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was very extensive.

Mr. WALSH. That is an unfortunate situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very bad.

Mr. WALSH. There is, I infer, a hidden rebellion in the breasts of some of the employees against their masters.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is great resentment at what is going on. Just such things as this are causing the resentment.

Mr. President, this board has not been painted or varnished. The wood had just been sanded on the particular day when we received it as an exhibit. We have testimony that as much as 3 days are required to make one of these boards. There are many other items. I shall only mention them, because they are knick-knacks. Nevertheless, they create resentment on the part of the men.

Another exhibit which I have before me is made of lignum vitae, a very important war material. It is a napkin ring. It will be noted that it is bored out in the center. One man told us, on oath, that it requires an hour to bore out the center. The men feel that these things are being made for private use and not for the use of the Navy in winning the war. That is why the question is important to them, although the articles themselves may be small. One witness testified that in the past week or two, 250 such napkin rings were made. A special machine had to be made to bore out the center.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were the napkin rings also for the club?

Mr. FERGUSON. We found no evidence of them in the club.

Mr. WALSH. The reason I ask the question is that I have been on naval vessels and have found in the officers' mess napkin rings furnished by the Government. I do not know whether they are of this particular type. The purpose of them is to save laundry. By the use of napkin rings napkins may be used for more than one meal. Did the Senator inquire whether these napkin rings were being made for naval vessels?

Mr. FERGUSON. The letter of the Under Secretary states that they are for naval vessels; but the men tell us that because of the way they are made, they are being made for private use. That is the opinion of the men, and it is such things that are breaking down their spirit.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator find any of them in the club?

Mr. FERGUSON. None in the club.

Mr. WALSH. So far, then, we have the testimony of the men that they thought they were for private use, and the statement of the Under Secretary that they are for official use on naval vessels.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If they are being made for private use, and are taken outside the yard, that is larceny of Government property.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to mention some of the other things which the men claim have been made in the yard. One of them is a dog house. Others are a serving table, knives, bracelets, rings, ash-trays, candlesticks, handbag handles, cigarette boxes made of solid mahogany, cigar boxes, candle holders, picture frames, and a screen for a fireplace.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I understand the Senator has said the men told him those articles were for personal use and were taken outside the yard.

Mr. FERGUSON. They testified they made them on Government time, they made them for a superior officer, and that is all they know about it. They do not pretend to know what he did with it.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, a superior officer might have some right, as in the case of the man with the safe, to have repairs done for his quarters; but, if they were made for an officer's personal use, it should not take 1 hour to discharge from the yard the master at whose orders such work was done. Of course, if it was done for naval use, the situation is different; but, as the Senator has said, the men at least suspect that it was for private use. The Senator has said that there is widespread a rather bitter feeling on the part of the employees against the masters.

Mr. FERGUSON that is correct. Mr. President, I am very glad the able senior Senator from Massachusetts takes such a great interest in this matter because it is a very serious one.

With regard to one item let me say I think even the strongest imagination would have difficulty in understanding how it would help us win the war. That is the item of handles for a lady's handbag. Other evidence was that a handle was made for a smoothing iron.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that my interest is to localize and fix the blame where it belongs, and to have some action taken against any wrongdoers. My interest is to make sure that the records of Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Horne, Admiral Jacobs, and the Secretary of the Navy—all of whom are innocent, and all of whom are gallantly fighting this war—are not tainted by the existence of such conditions in any part of any navy yard, without any action being taken. I do not want the Navy Department as a whole to be held responsible for a local situation which it is alleged is unsavory.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read now a portion of a report made last December by the Navy itself. Then I shall read the Under Secretary's letter, and I shall make a few remarks about it.

As I have said, the report states that it is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

I read from the report:

#### IDLE TIME

Idle time, as used herein, includes plain loafing, which is the employee's own fault; "stand-by time," when men are idle due to no fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for the furnishing of instructions.

#### STAND-BY

On the other hand, much stand-by time and loafing was observed on board ships. Idle time at St. Helena—

That is one of the branch yards there—

was excessive; December 37,578; 36 percent, 1,173; January 20 received 2,012—1,173, 839 separate; 40,000.

Part of it attributable to the fact that leadermen and other critical supervision bypass the ship superintendent and deal directly with the officer in charge at St. Helena.

They cease work at least 5 minutes before the whistle blows, instead of remaining at the job.

The tempo of work decreased perceptibly during the survey.

#### SUPERVISORS

Grades both 4-A and 4-B. Their pay is cut if the number of workers under them is reduced.

This wastes manpower.

Means should be found to make it to the advantage of all concerned to do the work as quickly as possible with as few men as possible.

Here is another criticism about putting the amount of wages on the order. Nothing has been done about it, but this report was filed about the first of December:

Making direct labor charges to jobs encourages overmanning because only one type—1-BM—of labor card is ordinarily furnished for each employee each day; the result of this, although not contemplated by the actual instructions, is that too many workers having short jobs hang around, sometimes doing nothing the rest of the day, even though the job assigned many times may have required only 1 or 2 hours' work.

In not a few instances, it appeared that team or gangs of workers are assigned to a ship upon arrival and they in turn stay with the ship until its departure, whether their services are needed or not.

That statement is contained in the report made last December to the Under Secretary.

Now let me say a few words about the turn-over of officers. I read from the report:

Officers' turn-over in key positions is high, and changes during the current 6 months are so numerous as to be detrimental to efficiency.

We find that the new captain now in charge has come from the Bureau of Ships, and he has been at sea for approximately 8 years. He goes as a new man to a yard where from 37,000 to 40,000 persons are employed. The commandant is a new admiral, just placed in charge of the navy yard. But please understand that the higher officers are not transferred because of good management but because transfers are routine. If there is mismanagement, it will not be cured by saying that men are removed, not because of it but in spite of it.

The report refers to Sunday work and to the so-called private items. The men work on Saturdays and on Sundays. They receive pay for overtime when doing such jobs. The report says:

Quite a number of employees were observed on Sunday manning jobs that appeared to be by no means urgent.

I assume that checkerboards or oyster-shucking boards, bracelets, and so forth, are meant.

The report further states:

Sunday work should be confined to urgent jobs.

It cannot be said that these conditions exist because of poor labor relations, because the report states specifically that "labor relations are generally satisfactory."

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to the letter which I have mentioned, because I think the release of this letter will have more to do with having these masters feel that they can do such things and not be checked on by those higher up than anything else which has occurred, not only in respect to the utilization of Government yards but in respect to the utilization of labor all over the country, because they will know that those in high office in the United States condone this sort of thing and even stand back of it. Let me say that I have not taken back one word I used when I said that such actions go almost to the point of treason, because I sincerely believe that actions which result in help and aid to the enemy, instead of helping and aiding the armed forces of the United States in this war, do border on treason; and, as the able senior Senator from Massachusetts has said, if the charges are true the acts border on sabotage.

I said that not more than 1 in 10 of the men were working. I do not take back one word of that statement, because it is absolutely true, and other Senators can vouch for the same thing. We saw that condition.

Mr. President, I will now read the letter. The Under Secretary of the Navy said in the letter:

This is a serious charge against a loyal and able unit of the Naval Establishment which I cannot let pass unanswered. The record of the Norfolk yard, including its labor utilization record, is good. During 1944 the Norfolk Navy Yard, in addition to building new ships (including 1 large aircraft carrier), repaired 2,458 ships so that they could return to active duty with the Navy. Of these 2,458 ships, 830 had to be dry-docked in the course of the repair work, and the Norfolk Navy Yard has the outstanding record of having dry-docked and repaired during 1944 more vessels than any other navy yard anywhere in the world. I do not believe that a navy yard with this outstanding record deserves to be accused by you of a condition amounting almost to the point of treason. Nor do I believe that this yard could achieve this record if, as you said, "not more than 1 in 10 (workers) was working."

Mr. President, if the men of that yard had performed the amount of work which the Under Secretary describes—the testimony clearly shows that they worked only 15 percent of the time—I say to the Under Secretary that they could have performed double that amount of work if they had had proper supervision, proper organization, and a proper spirit influencing them from the top.

The Under Secretary continues:

You offer in partial support of these accusations the following specific facts:

"A fancy checkerboard made of mahogany and bird's-eye maple was made for one of the Navy's civilian masters of shipbuilding at Norfolk. It was built by Navy workers on Government time. An oyster table was another luxury built for another master shipbuilder for an oyster party he was giving friends."

At the outset I want to make clear that all of the articles which I shall discuss were made for use within the Navy.

I do not know what he means by "the Navy," but I had never understood that civilian employees under civil service were in the United States Navy. It is

true that some of them use their status to avoid service in the Navy.

I continue reading from the communication:

They were not for private use or use outside the Navy. Moreover, they were made by workers in intervals between their more urgent assignments.

But, Mr. President, the testimony is clear that the so-called private work comes first and not afterwards.

The Under Secretary continues, as follows:

It is true that a woodworker in the Norfolk Navy Yard built an oyster-shucking board. The total cost in labor and material was exactly \$14.60, or \$11.97 in labor and \$2.63 in material. This oyster-shucking board was built to protect one of the yard's cafeteria table tops during an oyster roast which was being given for morale purposes in the yard.

Mr. President, that may have been building up morale, but from what I heard from men who worked there, it was doing just the opposite; it was breaking down morale.

It is also true that a few checkerboards were made in the woodworking shop of the yard for one of the recreational facilities at the yard. While an investigation which I have initiated indicates that the boards were more elaborate than necessary, each board required the intermittent time of one man for a total of 2 days. The cost of the materials was negligible.

Although you did not mention them in your interview, I understand that you also found that the Norfolk yard's woodworking shop had made napkin rings and had manufactured woodwork for one of the conference rooms at the yard.

Napkin rings made from waste materials and costing much less than 50 cents each were made in the woodworking shop of the yard for the use of officers serving on the new aircraft carrier *Shangri La*, which was built at the yard. I might add that this is standard practice at this yard. Napkin rings save napkins and laundry aboard ship.

As to the furniture in the master mechanics conference room all the chairs but one were removed as surplus from a ship converted at the yard. One chair and the conference table were built at the yard and were paid for by private funds of the Yard's Co-operative Association.

I submit, Senator Ferguson, that these minor items in total probably would not add to \$200 and are not sufficient basis for an accusation of conditions amounting "almost to the point of treason" against a navy yard having the record in ship repair and construction of the yard at Norfolk.

Mr. President, it is not the amount involved which is important, but the time which is spent.

I continue reading from the Under Secretary's letter:

It is impossible for me to discuss all conditions which may have impressed you at Norfolk.

Then he states that he does not have a summary or enumeration of the allegations made against the Norfolk Navy Yard. He then continues as follows:

The Navy endeavors continuously to improve operating efficiency at all its navy yards. Specifically at Norfolk two manpower utilization surveys have been conducted within the past year. The first of these was conducted by the so-called Andrews Board, which included civil service and industrial experts. The second survey, completed about a month ago, was made by the Industrial Survey Divi-



sion of the Secretary's office, an agency especially established to scrutinize manpower utilization in navy yards.

The officers of the United States Navy who are operating the Norfolk Navy Yard are as patriotic and hardworking as anyone in the Government, and are doing the best job they can with the largely inexperienced supervisory force and personnel with which they have to work.

Their operations are constantly inspected and supervised and steady improvement is being made as is definitely evidenced by the heavy decrease in man-hours required to build ships as compared to man-hours necessary for the same type of job a year or 2 years ago. There is no just basis for unreasonable condemnation of their performance.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I think the conditions which I have pointed out require the attention and consideration of each one of us, as well as of the Government. Why do I say "the Government"? Because I know from experience, and from the record, that many officials who are letting contracts state that they do not price them very carefully because they rely on the income tax for adjustment. They say that in that manner the Government recovers from 85 to 90 percent of the total profit. With regard to the remaining 10 percent they say, "We obtain that by renegotiation." But, Mr. President, in doing so they break down morale in industry all along the line. They state that a careful check will show that the work is done at the very lowest cost, because otherwise, when the next order is received, the men down the line would be able to obtain more money. Labor is not carefully checked, and, therefore, hoarding results.

We need the cooperation of industry in order to assure that the pricing is done properly, that we do not waste any manpower, and that the men do not sit and wait for work. The report shows that in some instances men have gone onto a ship in process of construction and have remained there for some time, even when they were not needed.

We need the patriotic cooperation of each and every laborer and workman, as well as those who supervise them. We should expose to the public gaze all these conditions by casting the limelight on them. I hope that our committee can go into the highways and byways in private industry and check them. I have reason to believe that the Norfolk Navy Yard is not the worst navy yard, or the worst arsenal in its waste of labor and manpower, and therefore I was glad today to hear the chairman of the committee state that there is a desire to check each and every one of them. I wish to say to the Navy and the Army that we hope we shall have their cooperation, and I know we shall have it, with few exceptions. I know what they must think about the "Cook tours" being conducted so that we may not obtain evidence. One man said that when the surveys were made the men were informed of them even 2 weeks in advance, so that they could get busy and show that they were working.

Mr. President, we are going to ask for the cooperation of each and every person, both in private and public life, so that every ounce of our effort, without waste of manpower or womanpower,

may be exerted in production for the armed forces, and so that it may be possible to supply properly the civilians at home who are making their contribution to the war effort.

It will require some praying on the part of those in charge of these important matters that they may have spiritual guidance, and on our part that we may be able to do what is before us, and finish it at the very earliest moment.

#### PROPOSED INCREASES OF PAY FOR CAPITOL TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has come over from the House of Representatives, House bill 1427, a measure relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange. With the bill there comes a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Accounts of the House, addressed to the President pro tempore of the Senate, now presiding, requesting immediate action on the bill, because it is to go into effect the 1st day of February.

Ordinarily the bill would go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The chairmanship of that committee is vacant at this time. In order that the bill may be expedited and passed so that it may become effective on the 1st of February, if at all, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the late Senator Maloney of Connecticut was the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not know whether any action has been taken toward filling that position.

Mr. McCARRAN. No action has been taken to fill that chairmanship, and I am making this request in order that the bill may be acted on promptly, and the Committee on Appropriations seems to be the proper committee to consider the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the ordinary rules, I suppose the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would succeed to the chairmanship of the committee, if he desired. He is not present today. I am not a member of the committee, but I think some Senator who is a member of the committee should take some notice of the situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not know why a chairman should not be appointed. I would guess that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] would be the new chairman.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Florida is very ill in the hospital at Bethesda.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know why the ranking majority member should not call the committee together. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is the ranking majority member.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to that committee considering the bill. My suggestion was made only in a desire

to obtain action on the bill. It was acted on in the House by the Committee on Accounts, and would probably go to the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate, but apparently, under the letter I have, to which I have referred, it was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It must be dealt with by way of appropriations anyway.

Mr. TAFT. What does the bill provide?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a House bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators in the United States Capitol. It increases the salaries of the operators. It passed the House several days ago almost unanimously.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should not be called. I do not suppose I could call a meeting. I should think the ranking majority member could do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am advised that the Senator from Maryland will return to the Senate Thursday. I merely counsel against action until that committee at least has an opportunity to be consulted. If the Senator from Nevada would agree to put the matter off until Thursday, I think perhaps we might be able to make just as much progress.

Mr. McCARRAN. My reason for presenting the matter is that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is now in the chair, presiding over the Senate, and I am making the request after consideration given to the matter by the present Presiding Officer. We think the bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations for immediate action.

Mr. CHANDLER. I feel bound to object at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I realize the hour is late, and I shall hurry through the remarks I have prepared for this occasion.

From all appearances, Mr. President, the Nation-wide debate over our foreign policy has taken on the earmarks of the debate during the last political campaign. It is full of dead cats, out-dated issues, foggy notions, and unnecessary vituperation which we can ill-afford in so momentous a discussion. This debate, Nation-wide, is mostly in the newspapers.

As my humble contribution to clearing the air for a more sound and sensible debate, I should like to present some thoughts now.

These thoughts are arranged so as to first, define the relevant terms; second, state the basic issue; third, reiterate my personal position on this issue; and fourth, propose a brief constructive program in line with my position.

#### DEFINITIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY TERMS

Now, first, if we are ever to come to a meeting of minds, we must reach an agreement on the meaning of the terms we use.

Therefore, I am going to submit definitions on five terms important to our discussion. Do not imagine that I believe that my definitions, or those of any other single person, will be universally

accepted without qualification. But, at least, they will provide a basis on which we may systematically proceed and be more adequate to our task.

The five terms most relevant to the foreign policy discussion in the past, present, and future are these: Non-interventionism, interventionism, isolationism, internationalism, and nationalism.

These words epitomize the opposing viewpoints among our people before and after Pearl Harbor.

Each of these words to a greater or a lesser degree has become a "fight word." Their very mention makes people see red. They have been used ambiguously and irresponsibly in smear campaigns. They have become filled with derogatory connotations.

Let us, however, examine them in the cold light of unemotional analysis.

Noninterventionism was the belief in and desire for America's nonparticipation in the European war either as a declared or nondeclared belligerent. Parenthetically, I may add that this belief was held by 70 to 90 percent of our people prior to Pearl Harbor, as indicated by every public-opinion poll.

Interventionism was the belief in and desire for America's participation in the Second World War as a declared belligerent.

Isolationism was the belief in and desire for America's abstaining from entangling herself in foreign alliances, abstaining from meddling in other nations' affairs, and the belief in and desire for America's playing a free hand in foreign affairs.

Internationalism is the belief in and desire for America's entrance into a supergovernment which, for the purpose of international peace, pools the sovereignty of national states and exerts dominion over those states in a manner supposedly irrespective of particular national interests.

Nationalism—and when I say "nationalism" I mean the new enlightened nationalism of today—is the belief in and desire for America's advancement and protection of its own interests and sovereignty; the desire for our cooperation in world affairs in a manner consistent with such self-interest and sovereignty and for America's participation in establishing a peace which will make for enduring peace, if humanly possible.

It will be noted that the past tense was used for three of these definitions. That is because "noninterventionism" and "interventionism" went out the window when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. We have been and are in this war for keeps. There has been no question of withdrawal before final and decisive victory is achieved. "Isolationism," too, has become a thing largely of the past. It will remain so, if certain developments which may produce a new isolationism are nipped in the bud. Whether we like it or not, the war, a shrunken world, and modern inventions have forced us into an alliance with our allies.

We have now placed in what I believe to be their proper perspective those three terms which may be well considered obsolete and inappropriate to our pres-

ent discussion. But before leaving these terms, let us take one more measure to antidote the poisons which have developed around these three terms and the two remaining terms, "internationalism" and "nationalism." Let us set the record straight by stating what all five terms do not and did not mean.

First. "Noninterventionism" did not signify a belief in or desire for nonintercourse with the belligerents. On the contrary, noninterventionists, by and large, favored uninterrupted trade between private American concerns and the belligerents and in addition, favored international arbitration.

Second. "Interventionism" did not signify a willingness to enter war for the sake of war. Interventionists regarded war as a slaughter and our entrance into it a painful necessity rather than an un-mixed blessing.

Third. Isolationism did not signify "ostrich-ism." The isolationists did not close their eyes to what was going on around them. Indeed, it was because of the very things they saw that they were isolationists. Nor were they isolationists because they abnormally hated one or the other belligerent, notably Britain or Germany. They were isolationists because of what they felt toward America and not because of what they felt toward foreign nations. They loved America so much; they gloried in our independence so highly, that they would not allow our beloved Nation to become the dupe or pawn of an alien power.

Fourth. Internationalism does not signify a lack of love for America. Rather, the internationalist holds America dear, but he believes his Nation can achieve the greatest good for itself and others only by surrendering its sovereignty into a collective pool of the sovereignties of all states.

Fifth. Nationalism, I repeat, the new enlightened nationalism of today, does not signify antiforeignism. The nationalist who exults in his nation and its people and desires to protect and advance their interests does not irresponsibly disparage or damage the interests of other nations and peoples. Nor does nationalism signify noncooperation. On the contrary the enlightened nationalist desires realistic and practical collaboration with other nations, but not at the price of the loss of national sovereignty.

These, then, are the relevant terms in what I believe to be their true light.

#### THE BASIC ISSUE OF OUR TIME

What, then, is the true basic issue of our time?

It is the issue of the two clashing concepts which we have just found by the process of elimination to be the only relevant terms to our discussion today: Internationalism and nationalism. It is around these two concepts that the opposing lines in our country have formed.

I, for one, take my stand on the side of nationalism, the new enlightened nationalism, free from the selfish excesses of the past. It does not mean living unto ourselves alone. It does mean using the instrumentalities available for this day,

I take this stand on the side of enlightened nationalism because I believe:

First. The force of enlightened nationalism is the dominant and irresistible force of our time, both at home and abroad, whether we foster it or not.

Second. It provides the only sound and realistic approach in our time through which we may meet the challenge for world cooperation and peace.

Third. It provides the only sound and realistic approach through which we, at home, may maintain and multiply the blessings of our American way and our American standard of living, and make our contribution to world stability.

In taking this stand, I am continuing along the same pro-American line determined by my conscience in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

At that time, the force of enlightened nationalism pointed unerringly to the absolute necessity for nonintervention in the war. In moving with this force, I took no action which I have ever since had cause to regret.

The overwhelming majority of our people were even then behind this force. I heard their insistent plea that we keep out of this war. I saw the pitiful state of our national defenses, the danger of "playing with fire" by undeclared belligerency; the complete lack of reward for us in war. What is more, I saw that Europe was then unready for and would be unresponsive to any sacrifice in blood we might make in the name of world cooperation. I remembered the past. I pray the future will be different in this respect.

As I declared then, all my sympathies were with the Allies. The danger of a German victory was obvious to me. Yet, even more obvious were the dangers of plunging an unwilling and unprepared nation into war and the danger of sully-ing our name in the eyes of the world by shamelessly breaking international law through devious means. Pearl Harbor did not decide who was right—the interventionist or the noninterventionist.

Now that our country is in this war, the force of enlightened nationalism still points the way for our people. And, again, it is my interpretation of this force and this way which guides my own thinking. Through this interpretation I have the fervent conviction that everything humanly possible must be done to make this the last world war in which American boys or any other boys engage. I have the earnest desire that we make every effort to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. President, in connection with the possibilities of peace immediately at hand, I should like to digress for a moment to clarify one point. In the recent debate on this floor on January 15, I asked the distinguished Senator from Montana if the President or anyone else in America had ever defined the terms "unconditional surrender." The Senator replied that he could not answer my question.

Language at times is a faulty tool, but it is the best tool we have to express our ideas. My only intent in asking this question was to ascertain whether we might further particularize our language and thereby clarify any misunderstand-



ing in our enemies' minds over the terms we use.

My concept of the use of the words "unconditional surrender" is this: When one nation states this as the basis for its enemies' capitulation, the victorious nation signifies thereby that it alone will have the right to designate the immediate and the ultimate terms of peace.

In our own history, Gen. U. S. Grant was known as Unconditional Surrender Grant. When Gen. Robert E. Lee asked for terms, General Grant stated "unconditional surrender," and Lee accepted. Then Grant did the magnanimous thing. His immediate peace terms fitted the situation and were an opening wedge to a reconciliation between the North and the South. Grant permitted the southern soldiers to retain their horses for spring plowing and also their side-arms.

I personally have never interpreted what the ultimate peace terms to our enemies would be following their unconditional surrender, whether they would or should be drastic or lenient. I believe that the decision as to the immediate basis for our enemies' capitulation in any one battle or for the entire war is a matter for the supreme commander of the Allied Armies in the field to determine. When the time approaches and there is the prospect of a cessation of hostilities, our military men will handle that problem.

Therefore, in summary, the leaders of the Allied States have determined unconditional surrender as the immediate basis for Germany's and Japan's laying down their arms. I would suggest, therefore, we get on with the business at hand of defining the ultimate meaning of that term, for it is over the ultimate meaning of unconditional surrender that we and our enemies are largely in the dark.

Belief in enlightened nationalism prescribes "don'ts" as well as "do's." Thus, I do not want our country to strip herself of her sovereignty and lay it in a collective "kitty" before the present rapacious greed and untender mercy of foreign nations. I do not want our country to meddle arbitrarily in the internal affairs of other powers. I do not want our country to pay through the nose as a Santa Claus or a Lady Bountiful only to be inevitably abused when we cease our donations. I do not want our country to trade a bird in the bush—a complete dependence on a hoped-for collective security—for our bird in the hand—primary reliance on our own national defenses.

I do want our country to retain her sovereignty while willingly collaborating with like-minded nations. I do want our country to be a good Samaritan, helping other nations to help themselves. I do want our country to proceed in her own plans for adequate national security. I do want our country to be eternally vigilant for the preservation of her liberty.

American nationalists are ready, willing, and able to consider these issues with those who differ with them. But I do not think that our nationalists want to enter into an acrimonious debate with the internationalists. We know that

such a debate would cripple our Nation. Such a debate would make our Nation a verbal battlefield with slander, abuse, and defamation firing back and forth. No; let us argue the respective merits of our cases calmly and rationally. Let us neither beat our breasts, beat the air, nor beat each others' heads. Let us not impugn each others' honesty or integrity on the floor of the Senate or off the Senate floor. Let us not forget that all of us as good Americans are agreed on the goals of peace and justice, if not on the means to achieve those goals.

But let not the internationalists misinterpret our desire for restraint in this debate as a confession of weakness of our case.

Rather, I, personally, have every confidence in the strength of the case for and of our peoples' desire for enlightened nationalism.

Every war we or any other nation has ever fought has resulted in a post-war resurgence of nationalism. It will be so with our own Nation after this war. It is so now with a reborn Britain, an invigorated Russia, China, and France. But modern war and a contracted world due to man's inventive genius have changed the picture. Our perspective is enlarged.

However, do you think for one moment that the 12,000,000 service men and women who are making so great a sacrifice for our flag will return and lower that flag before a foreign banner of some supergovernment and superstate?

Do you think, Mr. President, that they will not take a fiercer pride than ever before in our own Nation, after seeing the squalor, the poverty, the hatreds everywhere else in the world?

Do you think that the loved ones of our fallen servicemen will allow all that for which their beloved died, to be destructively changed one whit?

Do you think that our citizenry who have helped to build what are the world's greatest land, air, and sea forces, will permit our Nation to fall asleep at the switch again and allow a political or military Pearl Harbor to occur? No; continuous vigilance for a long time to come will be the price of liberty.

No; we have every confidence that enlightened nationalism is in the saddle and will be in the saddle to stay. And we glory in that fact, because we are certain it will prove America's salvation and aid all nations to build a better world.

It is for our internationalists to recognize the fact of enlightened nationalism's ascendance. It will be to their shame if they vilify it. It will be to their peril if they ignore it.

Similarly, the attitudes and actions of the internationalists will determine the lengths and directions to which our enlightened nationalism is to go.

If the internationalists persist in their slander of the so-called noninterventionists or isolationists of the past;

If they persist in trying to foist a guilt or inferiority complex upon our people;

If they persist in their either rubber-stamping some arbitrary unilateral actions undertaken by our allies or remaining at loggerheads over some such

actions because they have never come to a "cards up" understanding with our allies;

If they persist in their insistence on secrecy in foreign dealings;

If they persist in their plans for our continuing as a "sugar daddy" to the world;

Then, America may become nationalist to an undue extreme, even to embracing a sterner isolationism than ever before. At the very minimum, America may become so cynical and distrustful that it will only half-heartedly collaborate for peace.

That I, for one, do not want. Against that possibility, I urge that all reasonable measures be taken. I have faith that if we—yes; and our allies too—uplift ourselves from the level of bickering and name calling, and get on with the job that destiny, whether we like it or not, has thrust upon our shoulders, we shall discover in ourselves the stature to succeed in that job.

#### A PROGRAM OF ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Now, what would be the specific attitudes and the specific bases on which enlightened nationalism—and that is the subject of my talk—might have us proceed to success?

Let me suggest four points. They are: First. Realism and understanding.

Second. Sovereignty and constitutionality.

Third. Leadership and salesmanship. Fourth. Enlightened self-interest.

First, realism and understanding: This means that we must face the facts of life in the world today, understand those facts sympathetically, and then proceed on the basis of those facts in a practical manner.

What are those facts?

First. We have been "beating around the bush" with our allies. We have not "talked turkey" with the Russian bear and the British lion. We have not shown our respective "card hands." We are still in the dark as to our differences. As a result we have been shocked by sharp clashes of inter-Allied policy which came as surprises to us. Therefore, the time has come to get down to cases, bare our differences, and go ahead in threshing them out in a mutually satisfactory give-and-take.

Second. We have been having pipe dreams of the world. I could elaborate on the many pipe dreams you and I have heard. We have been picturing the millennium as just around the corner. We have been expecting our allies to sprout wings as angels, or we have been imagining them with horns, as devils. These pipe dreams only leave us in blind alleys. Therefore, the time has come to wake up, break our addiction to wishful thinking, and see things straight.

Third. We have been chained to the past. We have fancied a return to a static pre-war world. We have so slavishly thought of some of the world's errors of the past that we have almost come to the foregone conclusion that those errors would be repeated. Yet, we have forgotten the basic error of the past—the failure to recognize that all things change. Therefore, the time has come

to gear our thinking to the dynamic world of today; to learn from the errors of the past, but otherwise "let the dead past bury its dead."

Fourth. We have been obsessed with the possible forms of post-war organization. We have channeled all our energies into arguing over the rival details of the blueprints. In so doing, we have shirked the job at hand. As a result, our international relations have hit one avoidable snag after another. Therefore, the time has come to start doing the job of cooperating, in the knowledge that we will achieve the ultimate organization mechanism through practice rather than through theory. Cooperation is a two-way street—a thing of mutual intent and will and purpose—for all nations, not simply for America.

Fifth. We have not recognized the true state of misery of the world. We have not seen that the economic life of the European continent has been smashed to pieces by the war. We have not noted that the social structure of Europe has been twisted out of shape. We have not seen that Europe is bleached white, is discouraged, disillusioned, cynical, pessimistic. We have not seen its preoccupation with age-old problems of boundaries, minorities, and seaports. We have not sensed the problems imposed upon it by all the variants of class hatreds and struggle. We have not felt its haunting fear of the specter of more state socialism, communism, and fascism. As a result of our blindness here, we can be of little help to Europe, unless we awaken.

In order that I may better illustrate the vast differences today between the Old and New Worlds. I ask unanimous consent at this time that a recent article on this subject by R. H. Markham, be inserted in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. So, to conclude this part, let us recognize our blindness heretofore, let us resolve to open our eyes to these facts, to redouble our own efforts and our sympathy with Europe for these problems.

Sixth. We have not appreciated the tremendous emphasis which Europe fearfully places on its post-war trade. We have not borne in mind Europe's heavy reliance on foreign commerce as its life blood. As a result, we are often given to irresponsible statements and thinking.

To illustrate, it will be remembered that President Roosevelt, in speaking about plans for 60,000,000 post-war jobs in this country, said that to accomplish this the United States would have to triple its pre-war exports. That statement was greeted with the deepest concern across the Atlantic. As one Englishman Labor member put it during a debate in Commons, "If the Americans are going to export three times as much as they did before the war they are going to export unemployment to Great Britain."

Of course, I am not championing British trade, export or import, at the expense of legitimate American interests. But, I am making the point that such

loose and casual statements are taken by the British and other Europeans as one more instance of American misunderstanding and almost nonconcern; in spite of our high talk, with vital European problems. Let me say parenthetically, "American green pastures" are not distant. They are here in America. Here is the greatest market on earth. Let us remember that and better our distribution system.

Seventh. We have unrealistically failed to impress on Europe our willingness to see our mutual problems through. We have not driven home the point that it is our intention to stand by our obligations and that we have never failed in the past to so stand by them. Because of our failure to reassure Europe in this manner, we have provided it an out for its own forsaking of its obligations. Therefore, the time has come to make as clear as day our stick-to-it-iveness and our desire that Europe evidence this trait which it has so sadly lacked in the past.

Mr. President, the very dynamic speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on the floor of the Senate a few days ago probably did more to bring to the attention of our allies the real intent of America than anything else that has happened. Whether it will result in a nucleus for post-war organization no one can tell, because, as I previously stated, cooperation is a two-way street.

Eighth. We have unrealistically misrepresented our program of aid to Europe. We have given Europe the idea that we are either a meddler spreading home-made solutions or a fairy godfather lavishing blank but signed checks. As a result, we have set the stage for Europe ultimately to throw us out by the ear and call us Uncle Shylock to boot. Therefore, the time has come for us to demonstrate that we intend to help Europe to help itself, that we want to see its problems largely solved through itself.

These, then, are my points on the need for realism and understanding.

Second, leadership and salesmanship: Who is there to deny that America must assume its place of leadership in the world? Who is there to gainsay that we must display a caliber of leadership that will inspire the respect and admiration of the world and the world's will to pursue an honorable and straight path for itself?

In our leadership we must not lead by the nose, push, drag, or trick the world into cooperation and peace. Rather, we must do a genuine and honest salesmanship job. We must sell Europe the following articles on the basis of their own intrinsic merits:

(a) The utter futility of war as an instrument of national policy.

(b) The imperative need for a world peace authority with adequate power.

(c) The necessity from every standpoint—economic, political and spiritual—of observing the sanctity of the pledged word.

(d) The necessity of each nation living up to its natural obligations.

(e) The equality of all states before international law.

(f) The indivisibility of world security. Let me amplify this last point.

Any durable system of world security can be achieved only if the major powers of the post-war world first achieve their own reasonable security. And, since reasonable security is by definition a security which is not achieved at the expense of a similar security of others, it follows that the security of all nations is interdependent. Our own Nation, of course, of all nations, is least dependent on the security of others as a guaranty of its own security. But even we, in this shrunken world and in these days of abundant and destructive inventive genius, must promote the security of others in addition to securing inviolate a sphere of our own security.

Lastly, we must sell one further article—the American way. Yes; while our Russian ally is undoubtedly even now propagandizing for her form of government, we must do likewise for ours. This does not mean a high-pressure, printed-handout type of propaganda for us. Rather, we must continue to set "a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair." We have every moral right to hold up our Nation as a model.

A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

Yes; let us be salesmen of the light, even as we are exponents of enlightened nationalism.

Third, sovereignty and constitutionality: Let us ask of no nation and let no nation ask of us for a surrender of national sovereignty to a superstate. Let us cease our chatter of possibly depriving Congress of its right to declare war. But let us understand that in this stand we are not hamstringing our efforts for peace.

Let me make this clear. It is my opinion that if America enters into a treaty with foreign nations and if by the terms of such treaty a mechanism is provided for policing any of the world's areas by American forces, fulfillment of such policing action would not require a further act of Congress.

We are a constitutional Republic. Under the Constitution, the power to declare war rests in the Congress of the United States. The President, however, throughout our history has possessed the power to preserve peace in the sense that whenever the peace of this country was at stake, and there was danger of an insurrection, or when the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere was threatened, the President has had the inherent power to utilize the armed forces of the United States to preserve the peace without a declaration of war by Congress.

As a matter of fact, there might not be a clear line of demarcation between actual war and the result of the Presidential use of the power to preserve the peace. If the President and the Senate should enter into a general treaty with other nations, which treaty contains the joint obligation of the contracting nations to preserve peace, including a provision for the utilization of our armed forces to effectuate that purpose, I am satisfied that our Supreme Court would hold that such provision would be valid.



This would not be in derogation of congressional power to declare war, but in fulfillment of the inherent power of government to maintain and preserve peace.

Fourth and finally, our enlightened self-interest: Let us openly proclaim that we are going into the difficult post-war business for the same reason we hope and believe every other like-minded nation is entering it—for enlightened self-interest. We are going in not for territories, not for power, but for a peace, a security and a husbanding of our strength with which we may confidently and uninterruptedly work out our blessed American way of life. We are going to take out life insurance on ourself by helping to underwrite the life insurance of the world. Let us openly proclaim that we do not intend to cut our own economic throat any more than we expect to cut the economic throat of any other nation.

This is the program which I humbly suggest for our new day, a new day purchased for us by the blood and sweat and tears of our service men and women and their loved ones.

Let us advance confidently to this new day with the knowledge that it is always darkest before the dawn. Let us advance with sure step and clear mind. Let us shake the cobwebs from our thinking. Let us cease making a mystery of the obvious, a complex puzzle of the simple, and a paper theory of the practical.

This is the challenge to us in the ferment of our time. This is the answer to that challenge through the new enlightened nationalism, the nationalism of light which fulfills the word of old:

Arise, shine [America]; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

#### EXHIBIT A

##### GOOD AMERICA!—THE WIDE HORIZON

(By R. H. Markham)

Two years ago I left my home and desk to accept a post in a United States war agency. During much of that period I was away from America in a war zone. A few days ago I returned. Reentering America seemed to me a dream. America seemed as the Promised Land.

I know that is an extravagant statement. It is gushing. Such an impression is based on emotion. But I am not ashamed of it. It is wonderful to be in America again.

Now I hasten to point out that I did not undergo especial hardships, nor make appreciable sacrifices, nor face great dangers when abroad. I was just a civilian and almost all the time was well behind the front. I was adequately fed and usually slept in a bed. But I was in a very sad world among thwarted people. I had good companions, both American and British, and was surrounded by friendly people, but I was terribly lonely. Not only for my family and home and street and comrades, but for hope and, perhaps, for truth; for more equality among classes, for good will among groups and nations.

At times I sojourned near the Pyramids and ate food produced by exploited fellahin who are almost as restricted and warped and dulled as the slaves of the Pharaohs. I looked down upon Mount Zion and saw local turmoil, hatred, and injustice almost as rampant as when Abraham led his flocks past it. I was much in Italy, where I dwelt among people more despondent, discouraged, and crushed than those for whom the

Caesars prepared gory spectacles. It was a dark and sinister world and most of the few lights that appeared here and there through the gloom were false will-of-the-wisps.

I think that is why America seemed a miracle to me. America is hope. And much more. It is a demonstration that people can live well together. I know it has many defects. I know its future is uncertain. But this first week back home I shall not concentrate on those defects, nor dwell on that uncertainty. I shall rejoice in America's good things and draw inspiration from America's marvelous demonstration of brotherhood.

This week, America seems to me the place of brotherhood. It is a family in which we may all feel that we "belong."

Perhaps that is what we humans most want in our serious moments, namely, to "belong." In most parts of the world now, and indeed much of the time, people are as waifs. This week I don't feel as a waif.

I could almost imagine that the Statue of Liberty waved at me as I flew over New York. As our marvelous silver ship landed at Washington in the darkness of an early morning, I allowed myself the feeling that the lights were all glowing for me.

I was only a civilian among fighting colonels and majors and captains and among heroic fliers—at best I was a superfluity, at worst a nuisance—but still I was treated kindly by everybody at the airport. The Red Cross girls gave me coffee and even smiles. The information man speedily arranged for my further transportation.

The telephone brought me into immediate touch with two rather distant cities, bringing to my ears two sleepy voices which I had long wished to hear. The efficiency of American telephones is something unique in the world. It is a part of the American miracle. I felt like calling up everybody in the country and saying, "Wake up, folks, and say hello; a neighbor has come home."

Then I went to a teeming railroad station with people streaming in all directions and there seemed to be a host of helpers there to serve us "little guys." There were also special booths to make ticket buying easy.

There were many pleasant voices and everywhere beautiful women. Indeed, all the women of America seemed to me beautiful. I suppose they couldn't be, but they seemed so to me. I never saw anything like it any place else in the world. Of course, I know the mothers and grandmothers of America's women came from Italy, or the Balkans, or France, or Germany, or Scandinavia, or Great Britain, or some other foreign country. But America changed them all into Cinderellas—that is, those who needed changing. I think nowhere on earth have women been so inspiring as they could be in America. Here fairy tales come true.

In time—a very short time—I got onto an almost interminably long train. I was swept onto it by a surging stream of my fellow Americans. Most of us found comfortable seats. There were soldiers, sailors, WAVES, and WAC's, babies and their mammams, mothers and fathers who had gone to see soldier sons, teachers, storekeepers, war workers. They were all well dressed, serious, quiet. Some were sad, others troubled about the war, a few were happy over meetings or prospective meetings. All were self-assured and self-confident, free from hidden fear. One saw they were accustomed to travel in utter freedom. They expressed opinions without restraint. They cast no furtive glances for lurking detectives. They were friendly to one another. Many were reading, some the funnies, others about the world.

I felt like going to each one in my car and saying: Mr. Zulalian, Miss Olsen, Grandpa Jones, Corporal Ivanovich, how are you, my neighbors? Mrs. Murphy, Tony Zimbardi, Grandma Feldman, Lieutenant Terbesky,

hello. Shake hands. I just got back to our country. Mr. Werhuski, Sam White, Miss Zukaukas, Sergeant Miltiades, good morning. Isn't this a marvelous place? People really do live well, and are beautiful and help one another as neighbors, don't they?

When I got onto the streets of New York, a lady asked me to buy a Watchtower. She was a Witness of Jehovah. Many of her fellow sectarians are against this war and against our Government. Some even refuse to salute the American flag. But no one molested her. The United States courts even protect her. That seemed to me a supreme manifestation of freedom.

America seemed to me a marvelous place. That feeling of mine was not vain pride or empty patriotism. It aroused no impulse to boast. Rather a high and holy sentiment of gratitude. I felt like thanking God that it had been demonstrated that men can gather from all corners of the earth and found a good society with much freedom, much equality, and much good will.

I wanted to tell the exploited, fear-ridden, hate-torn, hungry people of a score of countries, "Brothers and sisters, don't give up. We shall yet create a world society in which men may live as neighbors."

#### DEFERMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, only the urgency of the question upon which I am about to speak, and which I hope to discuss as concisely as possible, justifies me in taking the time of the Senate at this hour in the afternoon. The mail of every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House from the farm States, the telegraph wires, and the telephone wires, bring us stories of the consternation that has spread over the farm area and among the farming population because of an order issued on January 3 by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

In describing the urgency of this matter, let me suggest that if commodities and goods are to be placed in their proper order, there is nothing so essential as food.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Are we to understand that General Hershey's order in any way interfered with or attempted to interfere with the validity of the Tydings amendment?

Mr. REED. I shall discuss that question in due course, if I may be permitted to proceed.

The Army cannot fight without food. The civilian cannot work without food. Nothing can be done without food. That is the first thing which is necessary. We have not too much food as it is. The demands for food for our own people, for our Army, for the Navy, for lend-lease, and for liberated countries exceeds anything in our previous history.

Mr. President, on this floor in November 1942 the Senate adopted the amendment known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. I think the Committee on Military Affairs was handling the selective-service bill. It refused to accept the amendment, and the amendment was written into the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I read now from Public Law 772, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 638, second session, House bill 7528. This is the so-called Tydings amendment, and it is

to be found in paragraph (k) of section 4 of the Selective Service Act:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board . . . to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

I have omitted some language which is not necessary to an understanding of the Tydings amendment and what it meant. It is still the law of the land.

On January 3, General Hershey sent a telegram to all State directors of the Selective Service System. He quoted first from a letter received by him from Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization. I now read what Mr. Byrnes wrote General Hershey:

You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age, the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Further on General Hershey quoted further from the letter from Mr. Byrnes, as follows—I now read what Mr. Byrnes wrote:

The War Food Administration, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

With that statement I agree. In other words, Marvin Jones, the head of the War Food Administration, upon whose organization devolves the duty of seeing that the necessary food is produced, said:

As long as you comply with the Tydings amendment, that will be all there will be to it, and we can get along.

But General Hershey did not stop there. Mr. Byrnes wrote him further:

I have reported these facts to the President.

Now I charge my fellow Senators to follow this language carefully. I repeat what Mr. Byrnes wrote:

I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me inquire who said that.

Mr. REED. The President.

Mr. Byrnes further wrote as follows:

The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like our other war industries, can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

Mr. President, if the hour were not so late I should like to discuss that very point. As a matter of fact, the population on the farms in the United States has decreased by 4,749,000 since 1941. There are now slightly more than 25,000,000 persons on the farms. They are mainly divided into the young people and

the older people beyond the ages of 50 or 60, whose working capacity is limited.

Mr. President, I telephoned the Bureau of Agricultural Economics this morning and asked them how far back we would have to go to find a point in our history when the farm population was as low as 25,000,000 persons, which it is now. I was told that prior to 1910, no separation was made of the population to show the farm population, and that therefore all they could tell me was that it would be necessary to go a way back of 1910, 35 years ago, to find a time when the farm population was anything like as low as it is now—with the difference that today the demand for food is greater than ever before in our history, and of course the need for production must correspond with the demand.

Now General Hershey has directed the State directors to forward the text of Mr. Byrnes' letter to all local boards. Of course that is proper. Finally General Hershey concluded with the following, which is in his own language:

In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II-C, local boards will consider the President's finding that—

And I quote again—

further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

After receiving an order of that kind from the head of the Selective Service System, through the State director, in a letter which concludes by quoting that language of the President, I think there is scarcely a local draft board in the country which would not assume that it had been ordered by the President of the United States, as well as by the Selective Service System Director, to take all these men.

Mr. President, you particularly are interested in this matter. The present occupant of the chair is the distinguished former Senator from Missouri, the Vice President of the United States. Someone might think that possibly I have overstated the effect on the draft boards and the State boards. I have dealt rather actively with this matter. Last Thursday morning the Kansas City Times carried a story based on an interview with me, describing this situation. I immediately received a letter from the government appeal agent of Bates County, Mo. He gave me some startling information, namely, that in Missouri the procedure was to take everyone, regardless. I immediately sent him a telegram asking him please to send me a copy of the order to which he referred. I received it in the mail this morning.

Let me read it, Mr. President. I am sure no one will be more concerned than will the present occupant of the chair; and if the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Vice President and former Senator from Missouri, does not proceed in his own State in this matter, then I shall be somewhat surprised and very much disappointed.

Here is the directive which the Missouri State board issued to the Missouri local draft boards:

A careful study of this section of the law, and a careful study of the directive in which the finding of the President is quoted, indicates to us that the agricultural occupation of a registrant 18 through 25 is not as essential to the war effort as the need for young men in the Army and Navy.

That is the language of the board, and none of it is in quotation marks.

I read further:

You will note the word "essential" is used by the Tydings amendment. Therefore, it would seem to us that the proper interpretation of this new directive is that practically all registrants 18 through 25 in II-C should be inducted into the armed forces if they pass the physical examination.

Mr. President, that directive comes from your own State. It was issued by the State headquarters of the Selective Service System, at Jefferson City, Mo., on January 4, 1945, and it is signed by Claude C. Earp, colonel, Army of the United States, State director. I shall be very happy to send the Chair a copy of the directive, if he so desires. I send to the Chair a press release which contains the language I just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wished to obtain the Senator's own interpretation of whether the President's statement is not again an attempt to override the legislative intent of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. REED. Oh, I very clearly think it is, and that is what it does.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that, after all, we are still a land of law, and it is still the function of the Congress, not the Executive, to enact the laws. If that be true, is it not the opinion of the distinguished Senator that in each case the respective boards are not bound in any way whatever, either legally or otherwise, by the statement of the President?

Mr. REED. That is certainly my opinion. Yesterday, being unable to obtain the exact information regarding what was going on in my own State of Kansas, I telegraphed Governor Schoepel and told him of the difficulties and of my lack of a clear understanding, and that I thought he should have his personal representative check up, through the office of the State director, and ascertain the situation regarding the operations of every local draft board in the State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has already answered the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I really rose to offer an answer to the question, because I joined with the junior Senator from Kansas in the resolution which provides for a clarification. If the directive of Director Hershey will not cause any confusion or will not in any way encourage local draft boards to take different positions with respect to the Se-



lective Service Act, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may feel willing to report the resolution to the calendar. I believe that to be the entire question. I am sure the junior Senator from Kansas agrees with me that it is not a question of how badly we need our farm boys. I have received many letters showing how badly they are needed. I am impressed with the necessity of bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that the directive to which reference has been made was issued by General Hershey and has been interpreted by draft boards in various States of the Union to mean that if a man is engaged in an agricultural occupation he is not as essential to it as he would be to the military service, and therefore the draft boards should automatically induct him into service. Do I state the situation correctly?

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to be as brief as possible. The hour is growing late, and I hope to be able to finish my remarks within the next 7 or 8 minutes.

I have received many letters and telegrams. One came to my desk only this afternoon. It is dated January 20, and reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: They are drafting farm boys here right down the line and past. And don't let any governmental buck passer or lawyer tell you any different. If you fellows are going to save many of them, you will have to work fast.

Mr. President, I have taken out of the mass of correspondence which has reached me approximately 15 or 18 short excerpts. I shall read 2 or 3 of them, and then ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remainder of them without reading them.

Here is an excerpt which reads as follows:

The farmers are terribly disturbed. Our Nation is . . . drafting our farm labor, saying it can be replaced with older men. . . . There will be hundreds of acres of land lay idle.

Another one reads:

There are 3 young men in my community who have farmed all of their lives. Each of them are the only help the aging fathers and each are farming about 600 acres, with as many as 125 head of livestock on each farm. . . . Each of these boys have been, or will be, called for service immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the excerpts to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We . . . protest action taken by State director in drafting agricultural labor who qualify under Tydings bill; under present procedure local boards are unnecessary.

Have a boy 21 who, with an older brother, has been operating 1,000 acres of land, 700 in cultivation. Received a notice from local draft board Tuesday calling him to Leavenworth January 27 for preinduction examinations. . . . Through this section of country almost half of corn is in fields, no help, weather conditions unfavorable for picker. We are feeding 150 head of cattle. . . . If this boy is taken it will just close

our operations. His father is 66 past and older brother is not well following a major operation. There is absolutely no help through this section. . . . Farmers are getting panicky, will be forced to sell stock, machinery, and close up.

The farmers are terribly disturbed. Our Nation is . . . drafting our farm labor, saying it can be replaced with older men. . . . There will be hundreds of acres of land lying idle.

Draft boards are drafting farmers right and left; essential young farmers are selling out. Farmers should be frozen on the farm as land will be idle and livestock sacrificed.

There are 3 young men in my community who have farmed all of their lives. Each of them are the only help of aging fathers and each are farming about 600 acres with as many as 125 head of livestock on each farm. . . . Each of these boys have been, or will be called for service immediately.

The order is here calling all farm workers regardless of how necessary they are to produce foodstuff not only for the armed forces but for civilians as well. . . . Congress certainly is not going to sit idly by and let a few men that do not seem to have the brains that they should have ruin the country. Men can't fight on empty stomachs and neither can civilians work on empty stomachs.

At a meeting of farmers and businessmen held in the Farm Bureau offices . . . we, the undersigned, were appointed as a committee to advise you of the critical situation facing this community, and probably all other farming communities, due to the new draft regulations . . . The records in the Farm Bureau office here show that we have over 200,000 acres of land in cultivation in this county with a total of only 454 farm workers. This includes farm owners, farm operators, all hired farm help. We are facing an absolute break-down in agriculture. . . . One large farm operator of this county advises that he does not have one man left to farm with and it looks like he will have to fold up on his operations.

I have 3 sons in service—two are in France at last report . . . These two boys were in the first draft. Our third boy enlisted in the Navy 4 years ago and has seen active duty. . . . I have a son 19 who they have been deferring because my farm operations depend largely upon him. Since this new decree it looks like he would have to go. If he does, I will be compelled to quit for lack of qualified help. . . . We milk 20 cows, raise cattle and hogs, also poultry in addition to grain.

I felt I just had to write you . . . I was born and raised on a farm. My brother, sister, and I still own that farm. We have a man on the farm who is past 60. He has two sons, one of them was drafted a year ago and if the other one is taken, the man simply cannot carry on as he can't do heavy work. . . . If this remaining son is taken this 360-acre farm will be idle . . . This is only one instance of what will happen if those men who probably never even saw a farm are allowed to have their way about it.

I have been disturbed a bit for some time about the orders coming from Washington. . . . It will take a lot of farm products to feed our boys. . . . My daughter has a son who will be 22 years old on February 1, 1945, who has been running the 160-acre farm, milking 7 cows, feeding about 50 hogs, has 25 sheep and some young stock, and 3 head of horses. He is the only

support his mother has . . . This boy was called yesterday to go to Leavenworth to take physical examination. If he is taken all this daughter can do is sell her stock and implements, close up her home and leave the farm.

Here is my case. . . . Just to give you a rough idea of how much attention our draft boards give . . . the Tydings Act. My oldest son-in-law enlisted and was killed. . . . Then drafted my youngest son-in-law. . . . That left me one son to carry on operation of 360-acre farm and I am crippled too badly to do any kind of heavy work. . . . At the time this boy entered the United States armed forces he was actually producing over 30 farm units besides farming 160 acres and feeding and producing the feed for over 40 head of cattle, milk cows, and beef. He had to take . . . a loss at sale for it was such a bad day and so many farmers are uncertain of their standings in the draft they are afraid to buy.

My boy got his call to go to Leavenworth. . . . If he has to go so will his dairy cows and all as there is no one to take his place.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to dwell briefly on the subject of the decline in the size of the population producing food. In 1940 the number of people producing food was 30,269,000. In 1941 it was 29,988,000. In 1942 it was 29,048,000. In 1943 it was 26,659,000. In 1944 it was 25,521,000, the lowest farm population we have had in at least 50 years, at a time when the demand for food is greater than it ever has been in our history.

Breaking the figures down, in the year 1943 alone the farms lost 2,389,000 people, and last year, 1944, the farms again lost 1,138,000 people. The total loss since 1940 has been 4,748,000 people.

Adverting for a moment to the point which the Senator from Nebraska raises, General Hershey is primarily responsible. Of course, he is subject to the orders of the President. The President, I think, has gone further in disregard of the Tydings amendment as applied to the farm-deferment question that he is justified in doing.

A few days ago on the House side there was a conference participated in by about 150 Members of the House of Representatives. General Hershey came to the meeting, and at that time this matter was discussed. One of the Representatives from Idaho read a telegram he had received from the State dairy organization of Idaho which described the situation very much as I have done. General Hershey said, "If anybody in Idaho or anywhere else is telling the draft boards to disregard the Tydings amendment, he is not speaking for the Director of Selective Service."

Yet here is the Missouri board, in the State from which comes the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Vice President, issuing an order which to all intents and purposes repeals the Tydings amendment, and orders that all deferments be disregarded.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Nebraska indicated, there are two important phases involved in this case. One of them, of course, is the production of food. The other is of equal importance, if anything could be as important as the production of food. It is whether a law

passed by Congress, written into the statutes of this country and still remaining on the statute books—and the intent is expressed in plain language—can be repealed by the President or General Hershey, or the President and General Hershey; whether they can disregard the law; whether we have come so far along the road that the executive branch of the Government can repeal or completely disregard a law written by this body which has not been changed in a single syllable since it was put on the statute books.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It may add some emphasis to the Senator's statement when it is recalled that the Tydings amendment is pursuant to the constitutional power of Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy.

Mr. REED. The distinguished and able Senator from Colorado of course is correct. Let me add this further comment: Two years ago last November I collaborated to some extent with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] in writing the Tydings amendment into the Selective Service Act. The Committee on Military Affairs of this body was, I may say, rather "uncordial" toward the amendment. Finally, if I remember correctly, repeating a conversation of more than 2 years ago, the Senator from Maryland told me he went to the selective service headquarters and told the officials what he wanted, and asked them to draft the language of an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would accomplish what he desired, and the Selective Service itself prepared the language of the so-called Tydings amendment. So here is an amendment to the Selective Service Act which, according to my memory, which I am quite sure is correct, was prepared by the Selective Service. It is still in effect, and should govern everyone connected with the Selective Service, all the way from the director down to the local boards. The Senator from Nebraska has very correctly said that draft boards are interpreting it differently the country over.

Mr. President, this morning I introduced a joint resolution following the language of a similar joint resolution which was to be introduced in the other House today, in which the Director of the Selective Service is directed to plant his feet on the law, to stay by the law, and to instruct every one of his associates and subordinates, and the draft boards, that they are to comply with the law as it is. That measure was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because it so definitely affects the production of food. The first impact of this disregard of the Tydings amendment is upon the production of food, and the joint resolution contains instructions that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to report back its findings to the Senate in 5 days.

Mr. President, this is a subject of such import that only the seriousness and the urgency of the situation justify

my taking this time at the close of a long and weary afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, supplementing the remarks I made a few minutes ago on the floor of the Senate when I stated I joined with the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas in introducing the joint resolution which he has now explained, I should like to say a word or two more relative to my position.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Of course, there is a manpower situation confronting this Nation which is most serious. Certainly, after the remarks which have been made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson] relative to the clearing up of the situation within the military forces themselves, certainly within the provisions of the joint resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas, which calls for an investigation into all Government offices and into all the industries of the country, we of the Farm Belt should also welcome an investigation of the farm boys who might have been deferred unwisely, or did come within the provisions of the act. In other words, I wish to go on record as stating to the Members of the Senate that we should do our full share in providing the military forces with the boys who do not come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I concur fully in what the Senator from Nebraska has said, and in everything I have uttered upon this subject I tried to make that clear. Let me remind the Senator from Nebraska that the joint resolution in itself, in terms, plainly indicates a lack of intention to interfere in the taking of boys from the farms whenever they are found at any place where they do not come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment, which means they must be essentially employed on the farm. The joint resolution by its own terms makes that declaration.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for making a part of my speech. He just took the words out of my mouth, and I wish to endorse what he said in my time, because possibly he explains the matter better than I could explain it.

I also wish to compliment General Henninger, of Nebraska, who has had charge of the Selective Service of that State, and our different boards, for the splendid cooperation they have given to General Hershey.

I shall take just two exhibits to show to the Members of the Senate the reason why I join in supporting the joint resolution. A letter I received from a town located near my home city, in one of the very fertile districts of Nebraska, where the farmers produce corn and meat, so essential to the military forces, as well as to the civilian population, carries this paragraph:

I am enclosing a report that was given to our local board at a hearing January 9, 1945, in our own case. The board did not consider production whatever. They say they have orders for heavy calls which they absolutely must fill, and all they have to fill them with is farm boys.

Mr. President, they could make no other interpretation than that, in view of the directive which has been issued by General Hershey, which restates what was contained in the letter of the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Justice Byrnes, which was used by the President as the basis of his directive which he gave to General Hershey, which calls upon the draft boards to determine that agriculture is not as essential as the military needs, and therefore that farm boys should be drafted to fill the quotas. That is what causes confusion and will continue to cause confusion among the draft boards not only in my State, but among draft boards in all States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to read a statement from General Hershey saying that service in the military was more important than service on the farm?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I did not say more important. If the Senator had been present—

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read the statement again?

Mr. WHERRY. The statement was made by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Reed]. He read into the Record from a telegram.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that is what he said I do not think it would admit of much doubt, because we must have enough men in the military service to win the war, and if we do not win the war there will be no use of talking about service on the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree once again with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The Senator was not present when I made a statement at the beginning of my remarks that we were perfectly willing to go along with all industry, and have the military authorities take our farm boys if in the opinion of the military authorities they needed them, but that they should take them on the basis of the Tydings amendment. I think the Senator from Kentucky is of the same opinion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read the extract from the letter to which he just referred?

Mr. WHERRY. I read from the telegram as follows:

In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II-B, local boards will consider the President's finding that "Further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator subscribe to that?

Mr. WHERRY. I subscribe to this, that if we need to take the same percentage of farm boys to help win the war that we take from any other industry and the military authorities say they need them to win the war, I have no quarrel. But I say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that the directive causes confusion among draft boards throughout the country who have taken the position that the President has issued a directive that agriculture is not an essential industry, and therefore farm boys



should be taken like any other boys when they arrive at military age, without the Tydings amendment being given the least consideration.

We have done a good job in Nebraska. In most of the States they have done a good job. But here is a directive which has caused confusion. We do not want confusion to exist. We want the Tydings amendment to be followed. It provides how farm boys shall be taken. We want the boards to subscribe to the letter of the law. We do not want any directive from the President or the Director of War Mobilization, or anyone else which will throw confusion into the minds of the draft boards so that they in any way will act contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sure the Senator will concede that neither the President nor General Hershey nor anyone else who has any authority to issue a directive wants to issue a confusing one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Many directives result in confusion; but I think we will all agree that the winning of the war is of the first and greatest importance, and if we have to take farm boys in order to win the war, then we will have to take farm boys.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and when the time comes, let me suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that I will go along with him to take them; but until that time comes I want to have them taken as the law of the land prescribes they should be taken, and that is according to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, if we can win the war without taking a maximum number of farm boys and at the same time let them continue to raise food for the country and for other countries we are undertaking to feed, that is what we want to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I subscribe to that statement.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not say that the directive did not confuse some people, because I have seen many confusing directives, but I am sure the Senate will agree with me that there was no intention deliberately to confuse.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that I am not charging any intention to confuse with respect to the directive at all. I am explaining my position in joining with the junior Senator from Kansas and other Senators in the resolution asking that this order be clarified, and I think the junior Senator from Kentucky would be glad to go along with us. It is not a question of whether we are willing to furnish the boys. Certainly we are willing to furnish whatever the military authorities ask us to furnish, but we want the military authorities to take them in the way the law of the land prescribes, and that is to take them according to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, it is not only a question of confusion. The question of need arises. A local draft board should not have imposed upon it the determination respecting agricultural need after the Congress of the United States has enacted the Tydings amendment. Agriculture has already been determined to be

an essential industry. If a man is engaged in agriculture and continues to be engaged in agriculture, the Tydings amendment provides that he shall be deferred to class II-C until a replacement can be made. That is the law. The directive alters the law. The directive circumvents the action of Congress. The directive runs right over the Tydings amendment. That is what I am objecting to. We are not objecting to furnishing whatever men may be needed when the time comes to furnish them; but we say they should be taken in the way the law prescribes they shall be taken.

Here is a letter from Mr. Coryell, from my section of the country. He is a farmer, a large operator. He says:

You would be surprised to see this country now. Our little towns that used to have 600 or 700 population are down to 75 or 100, just a few old men who can't crawl out of town. \* \* \* All the farmers who have any enterprise are either drafted or gone somewhere else. I don't know where they are going to get men for these farms and I can't imagine how we are going to farm next year without men or tools.

I have 30,000 bushels of corn that is in the fields, not husked, and I cannot find a man to husk them.

That letter is from Mr. L. L. Coryell. I did not ask his permission to introduce it into the RECORD, but I read from it because Mr. Coryell is one of our very fine citizens, and a man who is just as patriotic as anyone else in the United States with respect to furnishing men for the armed services.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the time has come when the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives should be the determining factor in determining what is an essential industry. No one in any Government department, either an administrator or executive, should override the will of Congress and issue a directive which runs around the fundamental law of the land and is contrary to the Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment is the law of the land and remains so until it is changed by the Congress. It should not be changed by means of a directive issued by anyone who says what is an essential industry, contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, I had not intended to make any extended remarks upon this subject, but the junior Senator from Kentucky suggested a few questions which brought about further discussion. The resolution was submitted in the best of faith. In submitting it there was no purpose of criticizing the military with respect to the men they need or the estimates they present. I have supported every military appropriation that has come before the Senate and every measure having to do with the war. I shall continue to support such measures. But I wish to say that when it comes to farm production, that production is just as essential as anything else. The Tydings amendment is the law of the land and if any changes are to be made in the draft law, the Congress of the United States should make the determination and the change, and it should not be done by some executive of a bureau in Washington.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is a considerable lack of understanding of and familiarity with the directive issued by General Hershey on January 3. In order to advise everyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what that directive was, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the telegram sent by General Hershey on January 3 to all the State directors be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,  
Washington, D. C.

State director advice (No. 288), issued January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18-25.

CONFIRMATION OF TELEGRAM TO ALL STATE DIRECTORS WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES DATED JANUARY 3, 1945

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust and eligibles in the 18- through 25-year age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator Tydings said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18- through 25-year age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need in the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried out by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the

full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II-C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II-C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II-C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II-C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of January 1943;

Rear Admiral Willard A. Kitts 3d, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of January 1943;

Capt. James D. Boyle, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of April 1943;

Col. William L. McKittrick to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 3d day of June 1944;

Col. Lawson H. M. Sanderson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of June 1944;

Col. Christian F. Schilt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 7th day of June 1944; and

Col. Charles R. Sanderson, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps on the retired list with the rank of brigadier general, for temporary service, from the 23d day of December 1944.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin C. Wilson, of Florida, now Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, De-

partment of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hattie W. Caraway to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry D. White to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nigel D. Campbell to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ross E. Brown to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harris Walthall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the routine nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1945:

#### SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin Jackson Kyle, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

##### TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

##### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

##### THE JUDICIARY

#### DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

##### To Be Chief Justice

Hon. Bolitha J. Laws, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Edward C. Eicher, deceased.

##### To Be Associate Justice

Hon. Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, to be Associate Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Bolitha J. Laws.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice James B. H. McNally, resigned.

##### PATENT OFFICE

Harold H. Jacobs, of Massachusetts, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank H. Duffy, Jr., of Rutland, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt. (Reappointment.)

##### SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, of Louisiana, for appointment as State Director of Selective Service for Louisiana under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 16th day of December 1944.

#### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Charles Pearce Bellican, Infantry (temporary colonel) with rank from June 13, 1943.

##### TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. John Baker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 29, 1942.

##### TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. James Stevenson Rodwell, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from October 24, 1940.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from December 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Thomas Lyle Martin, Infantry (temporary colonel).



To be colonel with rank from January 1, 1945

Lt. Col. George Sidney Andrew, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Roland Paget Shugg, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Rafael Larrosa Garcia, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Ellicott Hewes Freeland, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Spencer Albert Townsend, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Richard Clarke Birmingham, Infantry.

Lt. Col. James Cornelius Ruddell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Joseph Hamilton Grant, Infantry (temporary colonel).

#### IN THE NAVY

Capt. Frank G. Fahrion, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of February 1943.

Commodore Thomas P. Jeter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Capt. Marshall R. Greer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of August 1943.

Capt. Peter K. Fischler, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1943.

Vice Admiral Frederick J. Horne, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Jack C. Scott, from the 14th day of October 1941.

William H. Whitaker, from the 16th day of October 1941.

John B. Berteling, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Elmer P. Thompson, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.

Robert R. Read, from the 14th day of March 1942.

Albert L. Clark, from the 15th day of May 1942.

Stanley V. Titterud, from the 13th day of July 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Warren H. Keck, a citizen of Illinois.

George W. Bubbs, a citizen of Michigan.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

George W. Carrington, Jr., a citizen of New York.

William F. Lane, a citizen of Alabama.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:

Andrew S. Farago, a citizen of Montana.

Albert E. Leonard, a citizen of Ohio.

Francis J. Stutler, a citizen of California.

Roland A. Marbaugh, a citizen of Ohio.

Donald F. Dickey, a citizen of Oklahoma, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944:

Charles B. Spradley, a citizen of Texas.

James E. Garner, a citizen of Louisiana.

Ernest B. Ford, a citizen of Vermont.

Richard M. Bickford, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Ira Goldberg, a citizen of New York.

#### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

#### IDAHO

William Clay Peebles, Nampa, Idaho, in place of J. J. Walling, deceased.

#### ILLINOIS

Roy M. Hart, Fairmount, Ill., in place of K. E. Rowand, transferred.

George T. Hobkirk, Williamsville, Ill., in place of R. L. Cooper, transferred.

#### LOUISIANA

William M. Payne, Natchitoches, La., in place of W. E. Brock, resigned.

#### MAINE

Loretta M. Dwyer, Great Works, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clara A. Lewis, Litchfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Everett E. Clarke, Long Island, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Maud R. Tyus, New Harbor, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter W. Anderson, New Sweden, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clarence T. Caril, Waterboro, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary W. Dingley, West Farmington, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### MARYLAND

May B. Bolt, Eckhart Mines, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth V. Hoshall, Parkton, Md., in place of R. B. Hoshall, deceased.

#### MICHIGAN

Royce Glen Hayward, Casnovia, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marcella A. Doyle, Menominee, Mich., in place of M. F. Bilek, deceased.

#### MINNESOTA

Joseph C. Berg, LeRoy, Minn., in place of J. A. Schneider, resigned.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Ola B. Jones, Crowder, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

San Ben Hudnall, Porterville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### MISSOURI

James H. Powell, Elsberry, Mo., in place of R. M. Burchett, transferred.

Imogene Johnson, Galt, Mo., in place of D. S. Vencill, transferred.

Ethel I. McRaven, Glencoe, Mo., in place of Herbert Samel, resigned.

Oren G. Gamel, Half Way, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### NEW MEXICO

Dolores Romero, Roy, N. Mex., in place of M. Y. Ray, resigned.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Clyde B. Shaw, Carthage, N. C., in place of P. H. McDonald, transferred.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

Helen B. Hoven, Hoven, S. Dak., in place of L. I. Wright, resigned.

#### VIRGINIA

Manie R. Rodeffer, Keswick, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### WASHINGTON

Doris M. Stock, Allyn, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 22, 1945:

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Harry D. White to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

#### UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Hattie W. Caraway to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1943.

#### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Nigel D. Campbell to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois.

#### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Ross E. Brown to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

Harris Walshall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

#### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

#### APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

#### To be assistant surgeons

George F. Kamen  
William C. Redmon  
Wardell H. Mills  
Richard H. Linn  
Frank A. Buell  
Andrew P. Sackett  
Edwin D. Merrill  
Herbert F. Hager  
Vernon R. Dennis, Jr.  
Vernon G. Guenther  
James R. Hurley  
Robert L. Morrison  
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.  
Dean W. Geheber  
Isaac M. Zigler  
Arthur M. Pettler  
Jacob Wagner  
John S. Sheehan  
Harold B. Barrett  
Edmund R. Clarke, Jr.  
Ira Avrin  
Merle Bundy  
George W. Gibbins  
Ralph V. Kinzie  
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr.

#### To be passed assistant surgeons

Will H. Aufranc  
Gene B. Haber  
William P. Sellers III

#### To be temporary medical directors

William Hendon Gordon  
Leroy E. Burney

#### POSTMASTER

#### MISSOURI

Ruth C. Fossett, Mount Vernon.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Fr. Arthur J. Hagan, St. Margaret's Church, Dorchester, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Almighty and Eternal God, we lift our hearts and minds to Thee in prayer. Grant that every thought, word, and action of ours will be for Thy honor and glory and the welfare of mankind. We pray Thee, O God of wisdom and justice, through whom authority is rightfully administered, laws enacted, and judgments decreed, to guide and direct with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States that under his leadership our Nation will succeed to an early and convincing victory, and thereafter the establishment of effective means, in cooperation with other